DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 381 UD 020 107

AUTHOR Coffey, John F.: Chesler, Mark
TITLE Race Education/Training: The State of the Art; Issues and Dilemmas.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs.: Walter Reed Army Hospital, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 76
CONTRACT DADA-1576-M-P869
NOTE 138p.; Part One of a report of the Annual Symposium on Race Education/Training (2nd, Washington, D.C., September 15-17, 1976).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; *Educational Needs; *Educational Programs; Organizational Change; *Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; Racial Integration; *Sensitivity Training; *State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

The two papers comprising this conference report serve the following purposes: (1) to alert practitioners and consumers in race relations and anti-racism endeavors to the major issues in the field; (2) to facilitate continuing dialogue; and (3) to provide impetus for a more thorough assessment of the state of the art. The first, by John F. Coffey, reflects the views of the consensus of symposium participants on the state of the art of race education/training. Among the topics discussed are the history of race relations, participant philosophies, and issues and concerns about race educators and trainers. The second paper, by Dr. Mark Chesler, discusses issues and dilemmas in the area of race relations and race education. The paper focuses on the following questions: (1) Who are the appropriate agents or staff for training and change? (2) What are the critical elements for a training/education program? (3) What should an organizational diagnosis include? (4) What are some important components of a program design? (5) How can we insure maximum effects of a race training/education program on personal change? (7) How can we mobilize community support for race relations education? and (7) What are essential components of an evaluation? (Author/RLV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEC 18 1979

ED182381

THE SECOND ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM ON RACE EDUCATION/TRAINING

Co-Sponsored by:

The Walter Reed Army Medical Center
Race Relations Education and Training Branch

The National Institute of Mental Health
Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs

RACE EDUCATION/TRAINING

The State of the Art
John F. Coffey

Issues and Dilemmas
Dr. Mark Chesler

November 15, 1976

Contract Order Number
DADA 1576-M-P869

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD020107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATE OF THE ART IN RACE EDUCATION/TRAINING

PREFACE i

NOTE ON PHILOSOPHY TO RACE EDUCATION AND TRAINING PRACTITIONERS ii

PURPOSE AND PLANNING 1

BACKGROUND 6

STATE OF THE ART 11

- Philosophy 13
- Theory and Definition 16
- Marketing 18
- Planning 20
- Processes 23
- Research and Evaluation 24

ISSUES AND CONCERNS 26

SUMMARY 27

DILEMMAS AND DESIGNS IN RACE EDUCATION/TRAINING

- Definitions 34
- Programmatic Goals 43
- Assumptions about Change 49
- The Agents of Training/Education 50
- The Contract 69
- Diagnosis 77
- Program Design 85
- Conditions for Ongoing Personal Change 96
- Links to Organizational Change 103
- Links to Community Movements for Change 112
- Evaluations 115
- Summary 121
- References 125

"What White Americans have never fully understood-but what the Negro can never forget-is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it.

Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past; it now threatens to do so again. White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II."

-Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March 1968

FOREWARD

These papers - "The State of the Art in Race Education/Training" and "Dilemmas and Designs in Race Education/Training"- should serve several purposes. Among these, they should alert practitioners and prospective consumers in race relations and anti racism endeavors to the major issues and differences in the field. They should facilitate continuation of the dialogue that is necessary for the resolution of differences and improvement of cooperation. They should provide the impetus for a more thorough assessment of the state of the art.

If these purposes can begin to be achieved, race relations programs and other anti racism efforts of many in our country will owe a small debt of gratitude to the United States Army and Major General Robert Bernstein, Commanding General, Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC), and The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and its Director, Dr. Bertram Brown; and particularly, to the three men who advanced the idea, planned it, and saw it through: Dr. James R. Ralph, Chief, Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs (CMGMHP)(NIMH); Major Milton Grady, Chief, Race Relations Education and Training Branch (WRAMC); and Mr. Richard Shapiro, Assistant Chief, Racism and Mental Health (CMGMHP)(NIMH).

M. Carl Holman

M. Carl Holman
President
National Urban Coalition

PREFACE

This report of the Second Annual Symposium on Race Education/Training is divided into two parts because of its bulk.

The first part consists of the state of the art paper by John Coffey which reflects the consensus points of view of the participants in the symposium, and the revised issues and dilemmas focal paper by Dr. Mark Chesler - the original was mailed to participants before the symposium took place.

The second part consists of the edited verbatim proceedings of the symposium. Only those names, words and remarks which might have caused embarrassment to individuals were emended. Nothing of consequence to the state of the art question was left out. However, much that may appear irrelevant was left in. The hope is that the tone and flavor of the discussion has been preserved.

It is hoped that the reader will study and compare the two parts to get the feel as well as the thrust of the participants' experiences and concerns.

The List of Participants precedes the second part.

NOTE ON PHILOSOPHY TO RACE EDUCATION
AND TRAINING PRACTITIONERS

"Sad to say, we do not even have a committee to discuss and formulate this. Nobody seems to be emerging as the thinker, the philosopher, of the Race Relations Education and Training Movement, not even one comparable to Mason Hare, the philosopher of the Black Studies Movement.

"We need some philosophical leadership in this area - at least to the extent of formulating tentative philosophical position statements that people in the field could react to, discuss, subscribe, to or improve on.

"We do not have a sense of direction towards long range goals that would emerge as clear objectives if we had deep thinking philosophical leadership.

"I hope that the 'Manual' will at least be prefaced by a bold statement of commonly held philosophical principles that people in RRET could identify with professionally.

"We need a code of ethics like that adopted by the American Psychological Association and/or The American Sociological Association.

"We also need our own version of the Hippocratic Oath so that we will not be seen as paid hirelings of a special

interest propaganda group, but as reliable, responsible, self-governing professionals."

From A Participant's Workbook

The Second Annual Symposium on Race Education and Training was co-sponsored by the Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) at Washington, D.C. on September 15-17, 1976.

PURPOSE AND PLANNING

The purpose of the three day symposium, as stated in the invitations that went out, was to discuss and develop a state of the art document on race education/training. The meanings of the terms "state of the art" and "race education/training" were not explained or defined.

Planning for the symposium was done by a Committee composed of Major Milton Grady, Chief, Race Relations Education and Training Branch, WRAMC; James R. Ralph, M.D., Chief, Center for Minority Group Mental Health Programs (CMGMH), NIMH; Mr. Richard M. Shapiro, Assistant Chief, Racism and Mental Health, CMGMH of NIMH; and John Coffey as a private consultant. Lt. Col. Francis Marchand, Director, Human Resource Directorate, WRAMC, entered the planning process late; as did the six facilitators who were employed.

The Committee, though it had difficulty with the concept of "race training" and though it compromised on substituting the words "race education/training" for the words "race relations

education/training", failed to consider the possibilities that this difficulty held for the symposium. In hindsight, this compromise revealed a basic dichotomy between WRAMC and NIMH in their cooperative efforts, and portended similar dichotomies for the symposium. It revealed that WRAMC's mandate to conduct a race relations program was not entirely compatible with NIMH's mandate which was to conduct an anti-racism program, and the goals could not be reached through the same or similar processes. The goal of the WRAMC program was to improve and maintain harmonious relations between the races while NIMH's goal was to eliminate racism nationally in the mental health field.

In the first symposium in 1975, 25 of 40 participants had indicated that confusion in the art of race relations training was the primary obstacle in their understanding and practice of race related activities. In addition, many raised questions about the paucity and quality of research, the lack of training models, and the apparent absence of a philosophical and theoretical base for race relations training. Consequently, on Mr. Shapiro's suggestion, the Committee established the objective of producing a state of the art document to meet these needs. In this sense, the Second Annual Symposium was a direct tie-in and continuation of the first.

After some uncertainty around funding and a postponement, and as planning progressed, it became obvious that while WRAMC and NIMH agreed on the need for a state of the arts assessment, they really needed different state of the arts assessments for their own different purposes (Race relations activities for WRAMC and anti-racism activities for NIMH). The former required primarily process oriented approaches while the latter required primarily task oriented approaches. Race relations required interpersonal skills and anti-racism required competency based technical assistance skills. There were other subtle differences. But it was too late to change the format of the symposium. Too much had been done that could not be undone. Some of the literature, that had gone out concerning the symposium, spoke of "race relations" and some spoke of "race". The distinction remained fuzzy right through the symposium.

The strategies for the symposium were to (a) have a scholar/practitioner in anti-racism endeavors write a focal paper that would focus on some issues and dilemmas in race education/training (the paper would be sent to participants well before the symposium for their perusal); (b) get a nationally prominent figure as keynote speaker who would give a broad historical overview of race relations and racism in the United States so that participants would get some kind of perspective on how far the country has come and what their

role in the progress might have been; (c) set up taped and written feedback systems to capture the content and flavor of participant experiences; (d) use paid outside facilitators to assure completion of the small group tasks; and (e) charge one person with analyzing the responses to determine the state of the art among some 60 participants who were, among other things, practitioners in race relations and anti-racism training, interested advocates, heads of consultant firms, government bureaucrats, educators, and others peripherally involved in some aspect of race activity.

The Committee realized that the task would have been made easier if only practitioners had been invited. But it was felt that others, peripherally involved in race activities, would make a valuable contribution by providing a possible second perspective. (This turned out to be true.) Also, there were some personal and "political" considerations connected with who should be invited to participate: those who would feel hurt if not invited, those of some influence who might become committed as advocates to programmatic goals and efforts, and those who might provide critical input to the proceedings.

Mark Chesler, Ph.D., University of Michigan, was chosen as the scholar practitioner on the basis of his experience as a practitioner and the recency of his contributions on race issues to scholarly literature.

Mr. John Buggs, Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, was chosen as the keynote speaker because his agency is the repository for most of the literature dealing with racial conditions in the U.S., and his experience had taken him through the many phases of civil rights progress.

Originally, the Committee intended that the facilitators would be paid outside objective persons mirroring the race and sex composition of the participants. Because only six were needed, and because negotiations for the services of a female Spanish Heritage facilitator were unsuccessful, and because a question of travel funds for persons wishing to attend from the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) in Florida were raised, the composition of the facilitator group was one black male Army officer, one white male Air Force officer, two black male college professors, one white female administrator of mental health training programs and one male Asian American educator/advocate. All were experienced in group dynamics.

Mr. Coffey was chosen because of his role in the first symposium and his lengthy experience in race activities, including training and equal opportunity.

BACKGROUND

Race relations education and training is readily defined as any structured experiences designed to promote understanding, peace or harmony between races of people. However, anti-racism education and training is not so readily defined though much anti-racism education and training activity is promoted through affirmative action programs, equal employment opportunity programs, civil rights programs, and compliance programs designed to enforce civil rights statutes and executive orders.

For example, under Executive Order 11246 federal managers are required to monitor grants and contracts to insure that recipients of federal funds do not discriminate against minorities and also that the recipients take affirmative actions to hire and in some cases, serve minorities. Training activities (conferences,workshops, symposiums, etc.) designed to inform or make industry aware of these requirements might be regarded as anti-racism training. Or a symposium or conference designed to make industry aware of the available minority manpower in a given geographical location might be billed as anti-racism training.

Under Executive Order 11478 and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, it became illegal to discriminate against a person in hiring because of race, religion, sex or national

origin. In the Executive Order were requirements for the training of managers and supervisors, the development of upward mobility programs and the handling of regulatory procedures in discrimination complaints. Most of the training, the upward mobility programs and the complaints that ensued were focused upon the causes, effects and racial/cultural differences that created racial tensions and disharmony and led to discriminatory practices and policies.

Prior to the enactment of the above laws, orders and regulations, and in response to the civil rights crusades of the Sixties, we witnessed the establishment of dozens of anti-racism training centers organized mostly by colleges and church groups to continue the fight begun by the Freedom Riders. Definitely, the Freedom Riders who went south by the thousands in the Sixties were engaged in anti-racism activity. On college campuses they were taught to go limp, cover their heads, girls wear slacks or jeans. Was it anti-violence training? Self defense training? They were taught to expect to be called nigger lovers, to be arrested if they sat in a black restaurant, harrassed if they lived in a black neighborhood. Were Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney pro civil rights activists or anti-racism activists? Probably both, though it is doubtful whether they made fine distinctions.

For many decades in the United States, anti-discrimination efforts by the Quakers, the Abolitionists, the National

Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Anti Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, and others were clouded by the semantic and philosophical differences associated with the American orientation towards being discriminating in our social and cultural tastes and choices as opposed to the moral and legal requirements to not discriminate against people because of their color. Discrimination was right and good, except when it was based on skin color. Americans had long been accustomed to being told they were discriminatory, prejudiced, bigoted and unfair. They had never been told they were racists.

The fine distinction between anti-discrimination efforts and anti-racism efforts was drawn with the establishment of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1957 and the publication of its pamphlet, "Racism in America and How to Combat It", in 1970. Between 1957 and 1970, under the aegis of the national climate in favor of black participation in the political process and the leadership of many organizations and institutions, but particularly the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), action training centers were organized throughout the country. Their purpose was to develop political and economic frames of references around issues related to institutional racism.

At the same time, the white middle class phenomenon of race awareness training (personal growth) developed in a humanistic, psychological, social frame of reference. And the two movements worked together, supported each other, to expose racism to public view.

The Voter Registration Drive directed by John Lewis; the Welfare Rights Organization activities of George Wiley; the American Indian Movement of Dennis Banks and Russell Means; the unionization activities of Caesar Chavez, were nurtured in the street demonstrations that began in Birmingham, Alabama in 1955 and ended with the shootings and killings at Jackson State College and Kent State University in 1970. Direct action programs were no longer feasible in the face of the para military actions prepared and taken by the police. Those who cared about human dignity and the rights of man, moved without real choice, from street confrontation to change-from-within-tactics, change agentry.

They had no place else to go. The much debated police raid on the Black Panther leadership in Chicago that killed Fred Hampton; the use of guns on college campuses to quell dissent; the fury of the annihilation of the Symbionese Liberation Army; the awesome display of police power during the May Day Demonstrations in Washington, D.C., all served to give a clear signal that further change through confrontation would not be tolerated.

We learned that discrimination was good, but racism was bad. Laws were passed. The great American institutions took over, and overt manifestations of racism soon were dispensed with in much of the country.

The concept of institutional racism was further advanced by Charles V. Hamilton and Stokely Carmichael in their book, Black Power, and a new and complicated process of anti-racism efforts began. It was a far cry from the bus loads of freedom riders, the staged black/white confrontations, the white masks dialogues, the encounter groups and the sensitivity training.

Race relations training yielded the public stage to the Hippie movement, the anti-Vietnam fever, and the riots following the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King. They received a shot in the arm with the Armed Forces when black unrest led to confrontations on military bases and ships at sea. But the new emphasis was on fighting drugs, inflation and crime.

From out of this background came 52 people to the Second National Symposium on Race Education/Training to share their concepts, definitions, attitudes, experiences and endeavors in race relations training, anti-racism training, race research or whatever. Among them were equal opportunity protagonists; race relations trainers and anti-racism consultants, advocates

and change agents; military and civilian bureaucrats with varying degrees of responsibility and authority for administering federal programs, and professors from college campuses with moral and ethical investments and intellectual interests in race, justice and humanity; heads of consultant firms conducting training or doing research in racially focused programs, an observer from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, five continuing education representatives, an employee relations specialist, a social worker and a coummunity action program representative. Some, of course, functioned at more than one level.

Like all groups through all time, who have gathered together to decide on issues, they brought with them their own experiences, biases, prejudices, egos, knowledge, weaknesses and strengths.

STATE OF THE ART

During the preliminaries, each participant was given a Workbook which consisted of six titled sections (Philosophy, Theory and Definition, Marketing, Planning, Processes and Research and Evaluation).

The following information was printed on the cover of the Workbook:

DESIGN: This workbook is designed to focus your attention on some of the issues that might be addressed in assessing the state-of-the-art in race education and training. It should be completed by each individual participant, then used for discussion purposes in the small groups. A Group Workbook should emerge from the give and take of discussion. The Group Workbooks will be used to write the final state-of-the-art document which will reflect the consensus thinking of all the participants.

INSTRUCTION; Please do not feel restricted by the format and outline of this booklet. Add to it in any way that you want to. It is intended to serve only as a starter-upper, not as a guide. All opinions, comments and suggestions will be appreciated.

Each small group was to select a recorder, a group representative, and a negotiator as had been agreed to at the first meeting between the planners and facilitators on the previous day. The facilitators were to retain the recorder's Notebooks containing the group consensuses of state of the art assessments.

Each individual participant was asked to complete an Individual Workbook and leave it with the coordinator to be reviewed and analyzed.

All the general sessions were taped.

The state of the art in anti-racism education/training activities,

being defined as the general progress and conditions of efforts to achieve better social behaviors and political/economic results in the relationships between the races, the six sections mentioned above were examined from the point of view of the participants.

The symposium began as planned and ended with the following product which is based on an analysis of six Group Workbooks submitted by the facilitators, 23 Individual Workbooks submitted by participants and the transcribed presentations, comments, questions and responses recorded during the general sessions.

Philosophy

Philosophies were generally defined by the participants as the broad, axiomatic assumptions, principles, beliefs and ultimate values that support democratic,anti bigot endeavors to improve race relations or eliminate racism.

Participant philosophies ranged from the Judaeo-Christian Western Philosophy of Life and the 18th Century Rights of Man Movements to the Non-violent Philosophy of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Philosophical goals seemed to be overwhelmingly for preserving the dignity, rights and respect of individuals. A few indicated their goals were to build into the humanist

movement the purpose and meaning of society's institutions for governing itself. Some portrayed themselves as change agents restructuring institutions and systems. Others saw themselves as combating the polarization of the races. They saw their operational goals as promoting collaboration over competition; recognizing, celebrating and accepting differences (the anti-melting pot philosophy); liberating themselves and others from race and class struggle; and conducting non-violent and systematic political activity.

At a lower level, the participants divided along the lines of having confronting and dealing as opposed to conflict avoidance philosophies; collaborative philosophies as opposed to competitive; a sharing philosophy as opposed to the survival of the fittest; fairness, justice and equality as opposed to the Hitlerian philosophy of a master race.

The unifying philosophy, they reported, was human dignity. Yet, the individual notebooks contained comments of rage and/or despair: "help powerless people - cheat bluff cajole - if you fail, try something else-it all pans out to self interest we (trainers) exist because there is conflict-without conflict, I'd be out of business- the active pursuit of equal distribution of resources and the equitable application of rules and regulations are infinitely more important

than race education/training-racism is supported by classicism, sexism, diversity of cultures, economics and, some say religion."

This apparent dichotomy between expressions of goals and expressions of means seems readily explained by considering the requirements widely extant in the field for race relations trainers, race trainers and race consultants. Philosophically, the participants reflected characteristics of the three similar, but different types of individuals. Race relations practitioners were thought to think of themselves as morally committed activists. Race training practitioners were thought to think of themselves as confronting, no nonsense individuals. And race consultants were thought to think of themselves as results oriented social pragmatists, and sometimes change agents. These three, and a fourth type of individual, the bureaucrats who saw themselves as being involved because their jobs required it, but morally committed nevertheless, were all well represented.

The feedback indicated that the social pragmatists (consultants) were sometimes viewed by their colleagues as existential opportunists, wheeler - dealers and money men. The confronting, no -nonsense individuals (race trainers) were suspected of being emotional, irrational and divisive. The morally committed activists (race relations trainers) were sometimes

regarded as well meaning but either naive or coopted by the system. None of the feedback data reflected on attitudes towards the bureaucrats.

Most participants indicated that the energizing force behind the education/training programs was the civil rights struggles of the early 60's, the urban riots of the late 60's, the youth revolution, the drug explosion and institutional unrest that continues today. The basic philosophical ingredients, it was indicated, were the moral ought - the Hebrew concept of MISHPAT or JUSTICE - and the force of rising expectations on the part of minorities, especially blacks. The pragmatic socio-economic and political forces that had supported racial harmony, justice, equal opportunity and social-political participation through training programs had become passive because threats to property and institutions had disappeared. Most participants expressed feelings of being beleaguered, frustrated and outraged by the withdrawal of support of racism training efforts by government agencies and the general apathy of blacks. Some felt too that black separation and black racism philosophies were counterproductive to their efforts.

Theory and Definitions

Most participants acknowledged that race education/training

borrowed its principles and techniques from group dynamics and conflict management theory. One group defined race relations training as the art of the possible within the limits imposed by the types of people involved. One group stated that what it was doing could be defined in three components: anti-racism, race relations and cultural awareness. Another suggested that definitions would vary depending on whom they were for. Another suggested that defining race education/training as human relations training would be good public relations and have positive benefits. A significant statement from one group was that lack of definitional understanding and acceptance of race education/ training practices and techniques introduced semantic difficulties into training and changed its focus.

There was some attempt to define racism, but it was aborted by time constraints and negative reaction to the word itself. One participant suggested that the word "racism" should not be used because it was negative and blocked communication.

Attempts were made to define other terms such as manipulation, oppressor, genocide and colonial mentality, but they were unsuccessful and were dropped eventually as counter productive.

Discussion developed around the concepts of institutional versus personal racism; institutional change versus personal

gain; task versus process orientation, and human relations versus anti-racism efforts.

It was agreed by one group that definitions in race education/training were a serious problem. And although it was possible to define, measure and do something about it, the important thing for the symposium was to convince people that racism exists.

Marketing

Feedback on marketing was prefaced by statements indicating that it was difficult to do: Race Relations education/training was permitted when racial issues threatened an operation or the achievement of a goal or was supported by moral and ethical beliefs. The only time race education/training personnel were called upon was after a crisis had developed.

In terms of marketing programs, feedback suggested that race relations and anti-racism programs were easier to market when they were offered as human relations programs. One of the greatest difficulties in marketing, it was suggested, was convincing management that positive results could be expected.

The best marketing opportunities seemed to develop when race education/training programs were mission oriented, i.e., would sustain a market, increase sales, or get good public relations for the client through the media.

Good packaging was said to have been proved a good marketing technique. However, the most successful marketing efforts were based on pragmatic results such as reducing the number of EEO complaints, convincing managers that a race education/ training program would save them time and money or convincing management that a crisis would be prevented.

The most difficult marketing efforts were reported by voluntary agencies where race education/training personnel were unpaid volunteers. Some churches avoided inviting officially sanctioned race relations programs and even prevented them from being held in their facilities. Marketing was easier when church doors were threatened with being closed by the fluxes of changing neighborhoods. During periods of high tension, as when a district was under court orders to desegregate its schools, race relations clergy reported having little difficulty exchanging ideas with community leaders, but few formal training programs.

On a personal level, marketing was reported to be mainly through word of mouth. One stream of thought suggested that race educators/trainers were often selected on the basis of their reputations as pacifiers, for being the "right" race or sex, for being non-controversial and non-confronting, for their acceptability in the system. The most financially

successful black trainers, one participant stated, were those who were culturally white.

Minority trainers were reported used as front men to pose as team leaders in securing contracts, while the real brains and leadership would rest with a white who was ostensibly a junior member of the team.

Two participants stated that assignment to race education/training programs had damaged their reputations and careers.

Planning

Planning was reported to have been done around the objective of meeting expressed needs. No planning to change attitudes or behaviors was reported although several references to inclusion of behavior modification methodologies were made under the section on philosophy.

Much race education/training activity was injected into affirmative action plans because it was more acceptable to clients that way.

Planning was usually not long range, but extended only to the point of satisfying some legal or regulatory requirement that a client was under some pressure to meet.

Some participants suggested that the planning phase was

important as a period during which opportunities to effect change could be developed by identifying advocates, determining what risks could be taken and who the risk takers were, examining assumptions of change and developing organizational support systems.

The reason for the lack of common approaches to common problems in race education/training planning was said to result from the lack of contact and communication between practitioners who were widely isolated.

Planning, it was generally agreed, was usually tailored to individual requirements, or to the needs of the client, although one of the participants detailed a planning process involving trainees in choosing from 40 or 50 "racial conflicts," the five or six that participants considered priority and wanted to learn to deal with.

Additionally, in a large government agency and in the Armed Forces, planning was described in some instances as highly organized, integrated with other planning activities, and shared on the civilian side between the training officer, the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and the management.

Even in the military, according to one participant, the primary objective of planning was to get the best PR for the boss and the most bang for the buck. Most said that

the quality of planning usually depended on how much top down support was given to the programs.

A federal agency participant reported that all race awareness training under his direction was based on agency-wide attitudinal surveys and class/sex dynamics.

Another participant reported a developing program combining EEO goals, Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) goals and race relations. The relatively new organization has planned to increase the number of minorities in the organization and in high level positions; provide knowledge of state and national laws affecting minorities; devise strategies for implementing policies; and improve communications, problem solving and self awareness skills. This departmental program included race relations training only as a tie-in with affirmative action.

The same participant reported specifically what the groups stated generally-that the program was getting implemented only because the governor had put pressure on the agency director. Prior to this, the program consisted of statistical reports.

Also, the participant, probably not a trainer, was won over to an "advocacy" approach while attending a seminar billed as AAP Plan Writing which turned out to be an "awareness" session.

The feedback indicated that good planning is done in mandatory race education/training programs, but little is done in voluntary programs.

Processes

New organizational and training processes were described that were being developed to meet changed conditions regarded by the great majority of participants as regressive.

The U.S. Marines, for example, were said to be undertaking to train all leaders in race relations and to make each of them responsible for training their subordinates. The training process was said to be geared to rational discussion and debate, and strict observance of military courtesy and custom.

At a university, according to one participant, training processes involved six stages. Stage One required making participants aware of racial/cultural/sexual differences through information sharing. Stage Two dealt with definitional analytical activities. Stage Three required the use of and familiarization with measurement of racial attitudes in a personal assessment. Stage Four involved looking at sources of racial attitudes. Stage Five involved setting (personal) goals. And Stage Six involved establishing (personal) goals for future behavior.

From one school district, Children's Creative Responses to Conflict Programs were reported to have been instituted. The programs were not described.

The Army was reported to be combining race relations training with EEO and management type training, diluting the role of race relations in the view of some.

Apparently, if the reports were correct, the need and use of confrontive tactics and on-your-feet, hands-on type training skills are now minimal though they may be necessary again in time of crisis. The trend seems to have turned from the application of behavioral psychology techniques and towards organizational management techniques; away from soft sell and towards hard research; away from personality and charisma and towards performance and results. But the assessments of many of the participants were that these trends were being used to conceal the unconcern and apathy felt towards the problems of race.

Research and Evaluation

Research was described by most participants as a politically sensitive area where very little was being done. This viewpoint was strongly opposed by three people who indicated that good research was being produced but was not being made available. Further opposition came from a few who felt that

while good research was available and could be done, it was necessary at present, to remain as ambiguous as possible because of the national attitude and climate regarding race. Most however, clearly felt that it was necessary to be able to define and measure all aspects of race education/training.

A small group maintained that because race education/training was so political; and because, "when clearly threatening goals are well defined, they (the goals) are put in jeopardy by the power brokers in the system", the great need in research was systems to monitor race crises and incidents to help identify concomitant conditions in terms of where they occur as opposed to where they don't occur.

Though one participant was doing sophisticated research, most limited their research efforts to follow-up surveys on trainee actions, attitudes and feelings; compiling inventories of various kinds; answering inquiries; etc.

Research models that were employed in one way or another were Wolfe's Model for Conflict Resolution; Lauffer's Simulations; Maier's Role Plays; Kiresuk's Goal Attainment Theories; Mercer's Conditions Associated with Good and Bad Outcomes in School Desegregation; and others.

Some cited research outcomes in terms of increases in minority and female participation, employment, advancement and upward

mobility as the kinds they did. Most were dissatisfied with end-of-training evaluation efforts. They were thought to have little value except for "selling" one's self or one's program to a future client.

Overall, the feeling of a need for better research remained.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Great concern was expressed that race educators/trainers be competent and professional. Among the standards advanced for the identification and recognition of personnel engaged in race education/training programs were competence and the ability to continue learning. Criteria to determine if standards were met included a background in the social and behavioral sciences with experience in organizational development and systems technology.

Other comments were directed at the need for skills as opposed to "just blackness". References from two workbooks were made about blacks who were incompetent, had become culturally white or had sold out.

One workbook contained a suggestion that race educators/trainers should be required to subscribe to a moral or religious dimension in decision making.

Most of the participants favored credentialization of race

educators/trainers as a way of getting better recognition and improving competency,but opposed required credentials.

Ways of preventing educators/trainers from using group processes to promote themselves or their philosophies, make moral judgements, or harangue, was a concern for some, as was manipulation or domination of groups at the expense of group process principles.

The major concern expressed was that human relations training was being neglected, human values were being downgraded and human ideals were being replaced by materialism and institutional indifference to human needs.

A major need that was expressed was for identifying how self interests of whites are served by eliminating racism. It was suggested that professionals in the field of public relations might be used for this purpose if funds could be found.

SUMMARY

The Second Annual Symposium on Race Education/Training was dominated to some extent by feelings related to the deemphasis nationally on programs of civil rights, race relations, equal opportunity and affirmative action. Education and training programs in those areas have suffered heavily. Basic

differences between the practitioners in these areas of effort were surfaced due partly to the shrinking market for their services, but mainly because of their differing methodologies and philosophical approaches to the same or similar goals.

The goals of race relations programs (to establish racial harmony) were suspect because they supported other goals (combat readiness, pacification efforts, good public relations, etc.) that were not compatible with moral, economic and political goals.

Anti-racism education/training goals were perceived to be aimed exclusively at whites, and were seen as confronting personal and institutional racism on an awareness level without provisions for planned change.

The race consultant's goals were to effect changes in institutions and systems through organizational development, consultations, advocacy, expertise and, sometimes, education/training. Their change strategies and goals might or might not relate to racial issues, although all espoused racial justice as a concept.

Philosophical foundations of the approaches to race education/training activities were derived from religious, economic and political bases, and ranged from a need to reaffirm the quest for the moral ought and justice through direct action and

laissez faire entrepreneurship.

Race education/training theories derived principally from those of group dynamics and group psychology, with underpinnings of supporting concepts from religion, economics, politics, management and "the street". No progress was made in differentiating definitions and methodologies.

Indications were that there are no standard formal, or organized marketing approaches to race education/training. Marketing is done usually on a hit or miss basis. Practitioners remain basically at the mercy of the client, and serious ethical and moral issues are related to this condition which also has a negative impact on serious planning efforts.

Planning was generally geared to the needs of the client, but surreptitious planning activities or opportunities were sometimes initiated by practitioners.

Training process were not thoroughly discussed. Some allegations of violations of group process principles by certain practitioners were made. There was serious disagreement on tactics in group process. On an organizational level, training processes were seen as effectively captured by clients.

Though some sophisticated research and evaluation in the field of race education/training was reported, it seemed not to be

directly related to the elimination of racism, or the establishment of harmonious relations between the races.

In these areas, most of the participants saw needs for improvements in accessibility and acceptability to institutions. They suggested more sophisticated staff with documented experience and credentials as one of the necessary steps to improved accessibility and acceptability. Practitioners, it was suggested, should be completely knowledgeable about the state of the field of race relations, including especially, the effects of lawsuits and government policy.

It was suggested that race education/training programs should not be undertaken without the firm commitment and high visibility of top managers; that training assignments should be undertaken without pay or other rewards when the situation required it.

The Second Annual Symposium on Race Education/Training revealed the schisms that have developed in the movement. Bitterness and distrust, fed by a worsening economy, the seeming disinterest of blacks, and the truncated approach to minority problems by government agencies, have replaced the unifying efforts of the Sixties.

Though morale is low and human rights and relations are being neglected, the issues were clear. The art of developing warm,

friendly and effective cooperative relationships between peoples and organizations are more necessary now than ever before. The need for honest self assessment by race relations people, by anti-racism people and by organizational development people must somehow be met.. The stress of fighting for a piece of the pie must be overcome by deliberate choices of roles and goals within the unifying philosophy, the dignity of man.

Clearly, three different strains of human interaction endeavors have developed. They should be clearly definable in terms of philosophy, ideology and goals. As the struggle continues the issues should be resolved.. One can only hope that with resolution, will come deeper, more comprehensive understanding and acceptance of the meaning of the dignity of man, and inclusion of blacks, women, and all other so called minorities into the mainstream of American economic and political life.

November, 1976

Dilemmas and Designs in Race Education/Training

Mark A. Chesler*

Revised version of paper presented at "Second National Symposium on Race Relations Education and Training," Washington, D.C., September 15-17, 1976.

*In the preparation of this paper, I have drawn freely on the ideas of my colleagues Bunyan Bryant and James Crowfoot. John Coffy, Milton Grady, Kate Kirkham, John Leake and Richard Shapiro also graciously shared with me their reactions to earlier drafts.

The purpose of this paper is to sketch some of the common issues and dilemmas most of us encounter in designing and doing race education/training. I do not intend, nor am I capable, to provide answers to each of these dilemmas. Rather, I hope that by drawing them to our attention I can help us all reflect more deeply and share more fully on these major problems in achieving social justice in America.

Race education/training is only one of a variety of change strategies available to people concerned with reducing or eradicating racism in America. Organizational change efforts, community development programs, new legislative or judicial policies, alteration of political structures, and transformation of our economy are but examples of the wide range of other important strategies. Although race education/training is itself a limited strategy, it is a necessary component of any change program, since sooner or later all institutional or structural changes must be implemented and supported at the personal level. However, race education/training is not a sufficient program itself for the reduction of racism and in some circumstances it may distract energy from other important objectives. The reasons for these preliminary statements about the importance and limitations of race education/training will become clearer throughout this paper.

I can signal the kinds of issues and dilemmas dealt with in this paper in a table of contents:

Section Page

1. Definitions 34
2. Programmatic goals 43
3. Assumptions about Change 49
4. The Agents of training/education 50
5. The Contract 69
6. Diagnosis 77
7. Program Design 85
8. Conditions for ongoing personal change 96
9. Links to organizational change 103
10. Links to community movements for change 112
11. Evaluations 115
12. Summary 121

References 125

1. Definitions

I want to begin the discussion of dilemmas in race education/training by focusing on alternative definitions of the terms involved. Each definition carries with it implications for our diagnosis about the society and our goals and objectives for change programs. Disagreements over preferred definitions illustrate the political nature of different outlooks and goals in this entire endeavor. The definitions, here or elsewhere, are not arbitrary, and our language reflects our culture and our politics every bit as much as do our goals. For instance, the Conference title (and thus paper title) is "Symposium on Race Education/Training." It could have been "Symposium on Anti-Racism Training." Would that have made any difference? Would anyone have had different initial reactions? Expectations? Do these different titles, which are different ways of talking about our common program concerns, reflect different politics and different goals?

I assume that a basic goal of all race education/training is the reduction or eradication of racism. The term "racism" is used by various people in a variety of ways; it can be defined primarily by five broad forms of evidence.

1. In effects or outcomes, as evidenced in the unequal distribution of economic, political, and social status resources or rewards to varied racial groups.
2. In personal acts or behaviors, as evidenced in individual performance that creates disadvantage or lesser privilege or reward for some people or that leads to them being discriminated against.
3. In personal attitudes or values, as evidenced in public opinion polls or survey questionnaires of a broad range of the American public.
4. In institutional procedures, as evidenced in racially discriminatory mechanisms that provide differential advantage and privilege to people of different races, including locating the means of institutional control predominantly with one group.
5. In cultural values or norms, as evidenced in symbol systems (language), value frameworks or fashions more highly cherished by one group than another being accepted as the "right" and the "good." Further, in the ways some social and political roles, expectations and identities are distorted and/or made available only to selected groups.

These five alternative but non-exclusive forms of evidence, or definitions, help distinguish between individual racism (#2 & 3), and institutional racism (#1, 4 & 5). They also distinguish between cultural or attitudinal racism (#3, 5), and behavioral racism (#1, 2, 4). The following table may help illustrate these distinctions.

Table 1: Kinds of Racism

	Attitudinal or Cultural	Behavioral
Individual	Personal attitudes, Opinions, Values	Personal Acts, Behaviors, Choices or non-choices
Institutional	Organizational/Societal Norms, Symbols, Fashions, Myths	Organizational/Societal Procedures, Programs, Mechanisms

My working definition of racism suggests that it is a set of behaviors or institutional acts at the personal/institutional level that create or perpetuate sets of advantages or privileges for whites and exclusions or deprivations for minority groups. It requires, in addition to a set of social mechanisms (institutional practices) and an ideology (norms/attitudes) of explicit or implict superiority, the power to implement and maintain systems of privilege or deprivation (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; Knowles & Prewitt, 1969; Tumin, 1969).

I do not think that every white person consciously feels superior to members of minority groups, nor that persons

believing or acting in ways that maintain racial privilege and oppression always deliberately intend that state of affairs. In fact, the levels of consoious prejudice or deliberate discrimination may vary considerably. But intentionality is not necessarily the important issue in racism; it is not irrelevant, but neither is it always critical. People and institutions can engage in racism without knowing it and without meaning to do so. In some cases, their actions or policies have direct and immediate impact; in other cases their more passive responses have indirect impact through other mechanisms. But in whatever way persons or institutions contribute to a social condition wherein minorities receive lesser social and economic rewards, they help maintain and advance racism and injustice.

Racism is not an ephemoral, occasional or easily avoided problem in American life; it is a deeply embedded and fundamental part of our culture and political-economic structure (Chesler, 1976). If it were otherwise we would have a much easier time understanding, confronting and changing it. As others have pointed out, "In America, in the North as well as the South, it is normal to be a racist; it is behavioral conformity; it is fully sanctioned with rewards and punishment (mostly of a material nature) (Hodge, Struckman and Trost, 1975, p. 81)." Thus, it is hard for any of us brought up within a racist society, especially to the extent we benefit from the privileges of that society, to see racism clearly, and to distinguish it from other forms of "normal" behavior. As

Fiman, et. al. argue, the persistence of racial and sexual discrimination may be due in part to the "widespread failure to comprehend how discrimination works, especially how it is perpetuated without any particular motivation or intent by the normal practices and procedures of our institutions (n.d. p. 1)." An attempt at such comprehension is not only part of a good race education program, it is essential to our own efforts here to consider the design of such programs.

According to my definition, racism is not a bilateral or universal process. I use the term to refer to what whites do to blacks and to other minority groups, not the reverse. The reason is that institutional norms and mechanisms operate over time only insofar as they are supported by societal power. In our society, the power to maintain such institutional control and its advantages rests in the hands of white people, not in the hands of minorities. Thus, blacks may be said to be prejudiced in their personal values, opinions, or even to engage in personal acts of discrimination, but they do not in this society have the systemic power to engage in institutional racism.*

*Under certain circumstances, we might imagine exceptions. First, there could be isolated pockets of society where blacks have power, real power, autonomous from white control. These blacks could be racist toward whites, although I know of no such conditions now. Second, blacks could be co-opted by whites to do the work of controlling or discriminating against other blacks (or against Chicanos, Native-Americans, etc.) Under such conditions, those blacks could be said to be racist to other minorities. It seems to me reasonable that others might prefer a bilateral definition, or one that pays less attention to systemic power and more to psychological attitudes or social psychological interactions.

The largest minority group we must consider as the victim of racism is black people. But chicanos, Puertoricanos and other latinos or hispanic-Americans are also part of the picture, as are native Americans or native peoples (better yet because they pre-date "Americanization"), Asian-Americans, etc. The quality of oppression, distinguished primarily by race and color, demarks these minorities from other, numerically small groups, that also have experienced discrimination in America. The sheer multiplicity and complexity of racial, ethnic, and economic variations among and within various minority groups should alert us to the pluralistic nature of racism and its effects.

In terms of the realitites of institutional power in America, some may even want to reserve the term "Racism" to describe the actions of that subset of whites who are affluent, male, adult and generally Protestant (WAMAP), for they really hold and broker power in our major social institutions (Chesler and Worden, 1974). In this sense, the oppressed or non-privileged may be others than racial minorities; poor white people, and whites of various ethnic groups also are low on the distribution of political and economic resources and rewards. In stressing this point, Novack argues that "(white) ethnics were the victims of 'white racism' (1971, p. 81)," a phenomenon generated by the Nordic consciousness of early British and German settlers against later arrivals from southern or eastern Europe. Differences which originated in national or

ethnic traditions, and were exacerbated by differentiated access to power and privilege in America, have resulted in various levels of privilege and oppression within the white group. The rich internal diversity of our ethnic heritage has not been realized, because "while esthetic cultural differences were tolerated in areas such as diet, music and dance, a more intensive cultural pluralism that potentially threatened the existing distribution of wealth, power and prestige was not (Dashevsky, 1976, p. 191)." Thus "Nordic" control masked diversity and subverted equality within the white community, as well as between white groups and racial minorities. Regardless of the different status levels and privileges among white groups, however, the white-black or white-racial minority differences are overwhelmingly more important; I think they alone deserve the term racism. I will return to these issues later, but it seems useful to draw attention to them at the outset.

The second major assumption I make is that a basic goal of all race education/training is the creation or facilitation of heightened forms of consciousness or awareness. "Awareness" about race relations also has several different possible definitions, each of which has different meaning for the conduct and outcomes of education/training programs.

1. Increased information about the racial pluralism of the American society and, most specifically, increased white information about the nature of minority peoples.

2. Increased information about the nature of whiteness in American society. . . the collective history of white privilege, the cultural diversity of white ethnic groupings, the fragmentation and oppression of some groups of whites (on the basis of class or ethnicity), and the way racism effects white-white relationships.
3. Increased understanding of one's own participation in personal racism, namely an increased understanding of one's own attitudes and behaviors.
4. Increased understanding of one's enmeshment in a structure of institutional racism, and within the organizations in which we work and play. . . go to school or church, produce or serve, govern or defend, etc.
5. Alteration of one's behavior so as to act in a self-conscious and minimally racist way.
6. Implementation of concerted action to confront institutional racism as it occurs within one's life space, social groups, and communities and society at large.

These alternative meanings of awareness range from new levels of information, to new attitudes, to new forms of social behavior. For some, a concern about education stresses the creation of new cognitive understandings and perceptions; that can involve learning more about minorities, about whites,

or about oneself. One of the dangers of teaching whites about minorities, is that such information may be put to a number of uses - not all positive or oriented to social justice outcomes. If information alone is the content of educational programs, it may be safer for the focus of information to be upon oneself and one's own culture. For instance, Novack suggests that learning one's own ethnic identity and cultural history is critical: ". . . if you explore your own ethnic identity, the effort will not blind you to the subtle, provocative ways in which others differ from you. To understand what it is to be a Jew or an Italo-American is to gain some insight into the differences implicit in being an Afro-American, into black pride, into black politics, and the reverse (1971, p. 8)". Similarly, Novack feels it is important for whites to understand the ways powerful Nordic-Americans manipulated others' ethnic identities by promoting an assimilationist ideology that kept newcomers from promoting and celebrating their historic roots.

For others, active participation in new forms of personal and institutional behavior are the most important outcomes of educational programs. This stress recognizes that new perceptions and new actions are not only not the same, but that they do not always go together in a visible

and consistent manner.* Some time ago, Merton (1949) argued quite eloquently that persons may harbor prejudiced attitudes that are not reflected in behavior; and that persons may behave in discriminatory ways without harboring prejudiced attitudes. Thus, a programmatic stress on information and self - other understanding may not lead to any changes in behavior, especially if these understandings are not connected to the roots of interpersonal motivation and interaction. Educational programs that focus on new behaviors, especially behaviors undertaken in the context of small group, organizational or community contexts, may have more chance of being successful.

2. Programmatic goals

The discussion of definitions has included implicit references to the goals of race education/training. I want to try to make these alternative outcome statements explicit here, so that conscious and deliberate choices may be made clear. The problem of who sets the goals of a training program are as important to consider as the nature of the

*Thus, the social science tendency to rely upon attitudes as indicators of individual commitments or behavioral predispositions must be suspect; it certainly is different than observing actual behavior or institutional performance. This is a long-standing issue in social research and the problems are well documented in two excellent reviews, separated by over 25 years (Chein, Deutsch, Hyman and Jahoda, 1949; Schuman and Johnson, 1976). Interesting arguments can be had about whether the reason for this inconsistency between racial attitudes and racial behaviors lies primarily in the nature of human beings, the influence of social norms and constraints on individual behavior, or the difficulty of accurate social measurement.

goals themselves. For now, let us focus on the character of goals; but the reader should be alerted to the issue of whose choice it is, and to my discussion of that issue under the heading of The Contract.

The first set of goal choices revolves around the kinds of racism that might be the target of change in an education program. As indicated in the discussion of definitions, that choice may include individual or institutional racism, at either the cultural-attitudinal or behavioral-program level. That is, when an organizational representative asks for a race education program, she/he may want help in changing individuals within the organization, or in changing the organization itself, and in changing attitudes or in changing behavior. There is substantial evidence that changing individual attitudes is an important and feasible goal for an education program. At the same time, however, there is increasing evidence that altered attitudes may not necessarily lead to altered behavior. First, persons who alter their racist attitudes (information-based attitudes or evaluative judgements) may not necessarily replace them with anti-racist viewpoints. Second, persons with newly anti-racist attitudes may not know how to translate them into appropriately anti-racist behavior.

It is also problematic to move from the level of individual change to institutional change. The mere additive effect of many individual changes does not necessarily "add up to"

changes in organizations and institutions. Individual change is, from my own point of view, simply not a sufficient goal in a society rife with institutional racism and injustice. It may be a necessary goal, a first step on the road to greater organizational or institutional change; or, it may be a useful outcome of institutional changes. But the racism embedded firmly in institutional mechanisms and ideologies will not be countered by a few enlightened individuals, not unless their efforts are linked to large masses of others and organized into coherent and powerful social forms. As I shall indicate later, institutional change requires changes in the characteristics of institutions-organizations and communities - not just in many individuals.*

The second set of goal choices revolves around the different definitions of awareness that might be the target or outcome of an education program. At the individual level, again, I tried to distinguish between various kinds of "understanding", kinds that differed in their internal or external focus, their intellective or emotional focus, and their attitudinal or behavioral focus. Depending upon the kinds of awareness elected as program outcomes, different skills would be valued in program development and different learning techniques would be required.

A third set of goal choices concerns the relation of

*Later I discuss the ways in which programs can help people move from individual changes to the potential of organizational changes.

the race education/training program to the goals of the organization or community within which people are operating. For instance, if we seek to alter institutional racism, we must understand how racism might be related to the mission of the agency or organization involved. Is racism essential for organizational effectiveness? Or is it dysfunctional? What about the training/education program? Would its success aid the organization or agency in accomplishing its basic mission? Or would it only draw attention to issues the agency or organization does not wish to deal with? The enduring and pervasive character of racism in American society means we can expect to find it throughout all our organizations. An organization seeking to eradicate it is moving against the tide of the American culture, and might have to pay the short-run price of decreased mission efficiency, increased internal tension, loss of consumer or community support, etc. In the long run, of course, our hope is that the reduction of organizational racism leads to better internal relations, more efficient mission operations, more support from the community, etc. To be sure, it is not completely sure that this would happen. If racism is the norm from which we are rewarded, organizations that overtly run counter to that norm stand the risk of being sanctioned negatively by social forces that resist such change. There is risk here, and organizations may have to be prepared to make sacrifices in order to move positively on an anti-racist agenda.

As we consider the relationship of race education to an organization's mission and standard operating procedures, we should examine the organization's self-interest in generating such programs. The goals of an education program may involve helping an organization to survive in its present form, or at least as close to its present form as possible. We often see such an orientation active in the midst of a crisis, when groups or organizations seek to implement innovative programs in order to stem disruption and restablize or pacify their lives. In other circumstances organizations may have goals of making minor reforms, and may include race education programs as part of a move in the direction of anti-racist efforts. Such programming may use race education programs as the first step toward more potent organizational changes in the direction of racial equity or justice. Or, on the other hand, it may be used as a distraction, a token move that heads off further reform by providing an appearance of change where none is really intended. When root change, not just system maintenance, is the goal, race education programming makes a different kind of sense. One key to sorting out organizational goals is to direct race education to the internal issues potent in an organization. Such an approach prevents abstract programming that is unrelated to relevant organizational goals, and permits greater clarity and integration (or disentanglement, as the case may be) of the goals of race education with the organization's goals for employing this educational activity.

Another important goal choice is involved in the need to consider the relationship of racism to other issues of social justice in American society. As Myrdal pointed out, "The Negro problem is an integral part of, or a special phase of, the whole complex of problems in the larger American civilization. It cannot be treated in isolation" (1962, p. Lxxvii). Concern about racism must be linked to other concerns with eliminating sexism, age-ism and social class and ethnic discrimination. In turn, they all must be related to basic problems in economic and social justice that occur in a heavily bureaucratized, highly centralized form of state-supported capitalism. To take only one of these forms of injustice, and to separate it from the others, leaves various groups of oppressed peoples open to being played off against one another. To consider any of these forms of social injustice abstracted from its roots in our political-economy leaves us all operating in a vacuum.

All education and all training is political, of course. It all has to do with the reorganization of social values, and, potentially, with the generation of different organizational and societal programs. Therefore, it is both appropriate and necessary to raise these sorts of questions about the political goals of race education/training. In many circumstances, programs centering on individual information and understanding have been created and utilized as forms of social pacification. to satisfy protestors or to provide an arena for the verbalized

cooling off of racial tensions. Thus, some programs have tended to draw attention and resources away from the attack on basic organizational or societal racism. If that is all they are, they do not alter institutional patterns of racism, nor do they tap levels of awareness that include new behaviors and new programs of social action. Nor, in fact, do they move us toward a society or organization that can realize our goals of social justice. Throughout this paper, I shall try to be alert to these dilemmas of program design and usage that can render race training/education at least useless, and at most downright dangerous.

I consider working on goals of institutional racism more important than just individual racism, working on goals of activist awareness more important than just improving understanding, and focussing on the organizational or societal roots of multi-faceted injustice especially important. It remains to be seen just how powerful race education/training is in reaching these objectives. After all, we have lots of programs, but relatively little social change that can be traced to them so far.

3. Assumptions about Change

All too often, I/we embark upon change programs based upon the immediate opportunities at hand, or the resources we have available, rather than also carefully considering our assumptions about how we think changes really occur. Then we plan on the basis of implicit or unconscious assumptions,

and may end up doing things we do not really believe in. Thus, I want to stress the importance of explicitness about such assumptions, and to examine several alternatives here.

To set the framework for considering these assumptions adequately, remember that when we talk about altering institutional racism, we are talking about altering values, associations, institutional operations, and their support in patterns of established power and privilege. Some of the following assumptions might be fruitful to reflect upon.

1. Change comes through an appeal to the democratic values and moral commitments of people who have the power to make changes. This assumption suggests that all Americans owe loyalty to most of the principles of the Constitution and to values about race reflected in Myrdal's "American Dilemma" (1962). Recent research suggests that whites' attitudes towards blacks have become increasingly positive or tolerant (less racist) over the years (Hyman and Sheatsley, 1964; Campbell, 1971). Another interpretation of these data is that attitudes may not have changed, but that whites are increasingly reluctant to express anti-black attitudes in the current social climate (Campbell, 1971). Other data or interpretations argue that there is more white unclarity or ambivalence, rather than negativeness or positiveness (Schuman,

1969). All three trends may be net gains for our concerns. They suggest that as confused as we all may be, a fundamental American commitment to egalitarianism and to social justice can be counted upon. The change strategy implied here is an <u>appeal to good will</u>. . . establishing grievances, serving up information about racism, asking for fair play, etc. The expectation is that on presentation of this information, the white majority that becomes more aware of this situation will change itself or the conditions and organizations it controls.

2. Change comes through <u>reducing the basic irrationality of prejudiced people</u> and institutions. The basic assumption here, supported by considerable social science research, is that much personal and institutional racism is a reflection of irrational fears, prejudices, and stereotypes, generated via peoples' early socialization experiences (Adorno, et.al., 1950). Supporting these assumptions of the irrationality of racism (prejudice) is a vast body of psychologically oriented research. Generally, the following critical variables or factors are emphasized: defense mechanisms such as displacement and aggressive responses to frustration (Doob and Sears, 1939; Berkowitz, 1962); low self-esteem and categorization (Erlich, 1973; Pearl, 1954); stereotyping as a

function of perceptual and cognitive simplification (Gardiner, 1972; Tajfel, 1969, Tajfel, 1971); searches for value coherence and similarities, and assumptions about sharing or not sharing others' values (Rokeach and Mezei, 1966); and misplaced or erroneous attributions concerning the causes of social dynamics and phenomena (Ashmore and Del Boca, 1976). The change strategy implied here is the reduction of white's defenses through programs that include: (1) therapy that focusses on self-insights, raising of self- esteem, reduction of aggression via catharsis, etc; and (2) cognitive training that focusses on increased information about causes of minority behavior and roots of majority privilege, development of more complex perceptual or reasoning patterns, etc. When such programs lower peoples' psychological defenses, they can be supported to engage in more open behavior with regard to race relations.

3. Change comes through putting <u>people in contact with one another</u> to overcome the ignorance and fears bred by isolation, distance, and stereotypes. One important part of this assumption has been that symbolic contact alone may help. But the evidence seems to indicate that traditional forms of symbolic contact or education (lectures, speeches, movies, and

film strips about black people and cultures) does little by itself to change whites' behavior (Katz, 1976). Thus, it seems more fruitful to consider direct forms of contact, for instance, those reflected in patterns of school and residential desegregation (Deutsch and Collins, 1951; Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, 1967; Pettigrew, 1969). Here it is assumed that putting people together will reduce ignorance and fantasies and help build more egalitarian behavior and positive forms of social adjustment. The great deal of social research that has been done on "benign contact"suggests that this approach can be successful under certain conditions (Amir, 1976):

a. sustained contact. . . contacts made in school, workplace or the military may not be sustained unless they occur over considerable time, and in various institutional settings.

b. intimate contact. . . contact works best when it is more than superficial, but involves friendships and the creation of mutual and caring relationships.

c. equal status relations. . . in order to not reinforce old stereotypes and traditional forms of white-dominant relations, contact works best when they occur between whites and blacks of equal status (or even perhaps when blacks have the higher status).

d. cooperative contact. . . competitive relations reinforce old patterns of fight and flight, and contact works best when tasks require whites and blacks to be interdependent and cooperative. This can be implemented in the form of cooperative or collaborative goals, and mutually shared concerns and activities.

e. pleasant and positive contact. . . contact works best when it is felt to be a pleasant experience and when whites and blacks have positive perceptions of each other and of their work together.

f. institutional support for contact. . . contact works best when the institutional setting within which it occurs is supportive and rewarding of these patterns, perhaps even when systematic authority and norms require it.

Many attempts at generating change in race relations thru "contact" have not been conducted in such benign environments. The results have been disappointing, then, reminding us that contacts can have negative effects and reinforce negative stereotypes if they do not meet these positive conditions (Carithers, 1970; Katz, 1964).

4. Change comes through a <u>reorganization of whites' perceptions of their rational self-interests vis-a-vis racial matters</u>. The basic assumption here is that racism is not a product of irrational fears or stereotypes, but a reflection of the perceived self-interest of whites in maintaining their economic and political privileges, even at the expense of minorities (Blalock, 1967; Blumer, 1961; Ransford, 1972; Vanneman and Pettigrew, 1972). Rothbart (1967), for instance, suggests that white self-interest will result in anti-black attitudes and behavior especially when: whites feel they get less good education or other public services as a result

of desegregation; whites feel they are required to live as a minority in public housing communities or cities affected by fair housing statues; whites feel they lose income and jobs as a result of new hiring procedures. According to this assumption, effective race education/training programs would focus on the ways perceptions of the environment establish current self-interest relationships. One tactic would be to promote consideration of whether those subjective perceptions of "gains" are actually occurring, and what the "losses" or prices of those gains are to whites themselves*

On some occassions, education programs may foster the recognition that many whites are not just participants in the exercise of racism vis-a-vis minorities, but also are the victims of oppression by other more powerful and affluent whites. Attempts to inquire into the ways racism may work to the disadvantage of some whites may help all understand how their own position of relative advantage with regard to minorities may be manipulated by a ruling class of affluent whites who benefit in extraordinary ways from the current arrangement of race relations.

*Not only whether these gains and costs are real, but whether the costs really are occurring as a result of black activity, or rather the controlling power of white elites. Balbus (1971) indicates how false consciousness or a lack of consciousness on these matters may create non-rational resistance to change.

As Rothbart points out, "the cost of blacks' entry into the labor market is borne largely by blue-collar workers who become resentful of the competition from blacks. This resentment, although understandable, is unfortunate because it really should be directed at middle- and upper-income whites who are not equitably sharing the costs of promoting racial equality". (1976, p. 365). The same dynamic is found in school desegregation situations, wherein blue collar neighborhoods and children are the ones most likely to be part of a racial desegregation program.

Racism that separates whites from blacks and other minorities diminishes each group's potential, and creates confusion and doubt within the white population. The hostilities that often accompany ethnic group differentiation among whites (Jew v. Protestant and Catholic; Pole v. Italian v. Irish) is another example of division - this time among non-elite elements of the white majority. Moreover, the use of racism to preserve and perpetuate elites' economic and political privileges works to the material disadvantage of white working people. (Cox, 1959; Reich, 1972). As lower-class whites and females of all classes understand their exclusion from the higher reaches of American society, and the

way they are oppressed and exploited by reigning elites, they may act together to alter multiple structures of injustice - racial, sexual, economic, regional, ethnic, etc. (Boggs, 1970; Tabb, 1971).*

Race education/training programs that generate information about the state of this society, that connect white and black people's oppressive life situations with those circumstances, and that train people for political action clearly represent ways of linking race education/training to this assumption about how change will occur.

5. Change only comes <u>through substantial threat or coercion of the ruling white majority</u>. This assumption suggests that white elites will not easily change their advantaged position. . . at least not without perceiving that their ability to maintain advantaged positions is in danger. It leads to the strategy

---

*In fact, Novack (1971) suggests that "a coalition of blacks and ethnics (whites) will be inherently more stable than a coalition between intellectuals and blacks. For the real interests of blacks and ethnics - homes, neighborhood services, schools, jobs, advancement, status - are virtually identical; whereas the political interests of intellectuals are mainly those of a consciousness that can easily and often, as blacks well recognize, be false (p. 257)". Obviously, arguements about the most likely and effective coalitions can go either way, but the test of which we each elect comes back to whether we believe in the binding power of "rational self-interest" coalitions based upon class, or in "political value" coalitions based upon moral beliefs in the democratic ethos.

of mobilizing large numbers of minority people or disaffected whites to challenge or confront the power of those who benefit most from the system of racism. (Blauner, 1969; Gamson, 1975; Lynd, 1973). Race education/training programs operating on this assumption would teach people how to discover the vulnerabilities of ruling groups, and how to mobilize credible threats to their power. (Kahn, 1970; Friere, 1970; Lurie, 1970). Two distinct steps are involved in generating such threats. One requires the mobilization of large enough members of people and other resources so as to create enough power to realistically challenge the power of elite groups to maintain their rule. The other requires making this threat credible to members of ruling groups. . . visibility is helpful, as is the development of new myths or ideologies that suggest confrontation and challege (or maybe even overthrow) is imminent.* In either case, linkages between race education programs and other community groups or mass movements concerned with racial justice make good sense.

*We have already discussed how critical it is for elite groups to control the media and myth systems in order to maintain the legitimacy of their rule, and the competitive divisions among minority groups and between these minorities and poorer whites. By the same token, low power groups' ability to influence these same media and cultural myth systems may help them make elites more vulnerable to their attack and challege.

If we are clear regarding our assumptions about how changes in race relations occur, we each should be undertaking only those education/training programs that are built on those assumptions. For instance, race education/training programs may be very effective in instances where the assumptions require or expect good will and interpersonal contact as conditions for change, but not in those requiring the mobilization of power and challenge to powerful groups. Or, the nature of the assumptions may dramatically affect the choice of education/training design, staff, skill training activities and evaluative format.

I can illustrate some of these relationships between assumptions and program designs in the following table.

Table 2: Some relationships between change assumptions and target groups

Assumptions about change	Target Groups A. Powerful whites	B. Low power whites	C. Minority members
1. Appeal to democratic values.			
2. Reduce irrational prejudice.			
3. Encourage interracial contact.			
4. Reorganize whites' perceptions of self-interest.			
5. Threaten elites.			

Each set of assumptions about change might make it more important to work with some target groups rather than others. Appealing to powerful whites' moral commitments to racial equality or justice obviously requires working with target population A. Reducing whites' irrational fears and prejudices requires working with target populations A and/or B. Assumption 3, however, encouraging interracial contact as a means of change, obviously implies working with target population C as well, especially with B and in some circumstances with A.* What primary target populations should we work with in implementing change assumptions 4 and 5.

What skills or training outcomes would be most important for each box (letter-number combination)? Greater information about the society could be especially important in 4-A and B, and in 1-A; maybe elsewhere as well. Skills in political organizing from below would be quite relevant for 4-B and 5-B, C, but not clearly so for 3-A,B,C, not in 2-A, B, nor in 1-A, B. What other critical skills would you locate in various boxes?

We shall return to these design questions and choices about goals and strategies throughout the paper.

4. The agents of education/training

Who should be conducting race education/training programs?

---

*"Especially" and "in some circumstances", because of the research that indicates whites learn positive racial lessons best from contacts with equal or higher status minorities. . . not from those of lower status.

Obviously, people of compassion and sensitivity and integrity. And just as obviously, people who are sophisticated about the issues in race relations, both in terms of the social structures and the interpersonal dynamics that support racism. But knowledge alone is not enough; educators must be able to deliver or surface such information in ways that are meaningful and useful to practitioners and community or organizational members. This may require careful screening of academics and others who have great information-based authority, but not necessarily the ability to deliver it effectively to relevant audiences.

Another important requisite seems to be technical skills in planning a variety of designs for education/training programs. Programming for race training/education is different from other kinds of education, although many of the same skills in innovative or experiental learning systems will be relevant. Race educators may learn these programming and change skills in various arenas (on the streets, in workshops, in movement activities), not only in the carefully accredited systems that prepare multi-faceted and multi-purpose educators or even human relations' facilitators. In the long run, informal word of mouth and peer recommendations is probably the best source for screening potential change agents. Of course, there are various kinds of informal networks; some are oriented toward outcomes of conflict pacification, others toward conflict resolution or bargaining, and still others toward social justice.

Trainers/educators, like us all, have and act on the basis of certain values, assumptions, and political ideologies. It makes sense for the staff of a race education/training program to be screened on the basis of their own goals and views regarding racial and other kinds of change. No expertise is neutral in use, and the use of professional and neutral terms like "facilitator" and "educator" often masks the controversial nature of the fight for racial justice (Cormick and Laue, 1976; Chesler, Bryant and Crowfoot, 1976). I am concerned that we not get so invested in academic and professional credentials that we lose sight of the key skills and orientations required for successful work in this area.

The more we attempt to "professionalize" the field of race relations education, the more we buy into all the self-serving aspects of professionalism. The fetish for credentials often masks true competence, especially competence that appears to be non-neutral in politics or cultural style. These problems are relevant because they effect more than the controllers of the professions - white elites who generate the knowledge base sanctified by university and public bodies - but others as well. For instance, Novack (1971, p. 37) argues that, "The bias of the professional classes in America, in short, disguises ethnicity. To become a professional is ordinarily to acquiese in separation by no little gap from the people among whom one was born." Thus, one of the great dangers of professionalizing this field is that it might define expertise

in ways that require minority people to assimilate white standards and models in order to be credentialed. And further, it might stablize and standardize race education training in the same way as other variants of higher education and human relations training have been standardized - as instrumments of minor reform, as covert agents of white organizational elites, as means for the self-interest gains of an affluent class masked as neutrality and universal public service.

Is the race of the trainer/educator a relevant qualification or consideration? One of the most important issues in sustaining racism is the majority group's power, and its ability to use that power to develop new forms of controlling minorities. In that context, white standards or leadership of race education/training programs may run dangerously close to being another illustration of white power and privilege. Certainly this is not always the case, not is this a necessary argument against white involvement in and/or leadership of race education/training programs. However, it would be foolish to overlook this issue.

I consider race education/training as one arena in which it is both possible and necessary to reverse the standard pattern of racial power in our society and educational systems. Minority control or white/black/brown collaboration in the leadership of such programs should be an important principle. The use of a multi-cultural leadership staff certainly deals with some of the historic problems of white power in racial education. However, my experience is that interracial staffs

generally must solve within themselves the same general problem of power and control. I know of no training staff, despite any contrary protestations, that operates on a purely democratic model without some informal hierarchy of authority. As long as this is the case, the question of whether that authority shall be white or minority once again must be raised.

Particularly where white leadership is being exercised, it is imperative for minorities to monitor that leadership actively, and to hold that leadership accountable for what it does with its' power and privilege (Karenga, 1969). It is rare in this society for whites to be accountable to minorities; the dominant pattern is minority accountability to responsible white authority. Renovation of these patterns in the conduct of race training/education programs can stand as a model for a new future.

I think community groups (just like organizational managers) can make good judgements about the educators/trainers they want and need, especially if we do not confuse these groups by suggesting there are experts who they are too ignorant to understand and appreciate. Reliance on such a localized screening process may be more cumbersome than a well developed professional roster, but it also avoids some of the dangers of a list generated and sanctioned by a self-selected group of experts. Organizational or community selection can also help solve some of the problems involved in establishing the training staff's accountability to the group they are serving.

One of the hallmarks of a profession is that it is accountable to other members of the profession, and maybe to the state body that certifies professional status, but not to the people it serves. This is one of the great dangers associated with professionalization; that it may increase autonomy for designers of change programs while decreasing even further local groups' ability to control the services they receive. An alternative would involve educators in establishing community groups, or caucuses within organizations, to which they report and are accountable. If these groups or caucuses include large numbers of minority group members, they may also help provide minority monitoring and accountability for minority as well as white staff members.

Issues of collaboration, monitoring, and minority control raise another staffing consideration. White experts who conduct race training/education programs are not necessarily experienced and capable in following minority leadership.* This may be especially problematic if those experts are accustomed to operating as academic professionals, with a great deal of autonomy and authority over captive audiences. Thus, white professionals may need to undergo first a priority training program of their own, one which would accomodate them to the special rigors of working with minority leadership. New

*Of course, some may not be capable of following majority leadership either. Far too often training staffs fail to provide time and energy to support and care for one another, support that is crucial in the midst of risky change efforts.

definitions of ego, of self-insight, of expertise, and new understandings of sabotage, of control of sharing, and of collaboration, are all critical in the development of white collaboration in minority-led enterprises, and of white-minority collaboration under any conditions.

Individually and as a team, staff members should be prepared to act as role models for participants in a race training/education program. Part of the reason for screening staff members on the basis of their politics and actions, and not just their apparent "technical" expertise, is to insure that training/education program participants experience good examples of anti-racist attitudes and behaviors. Since my own notion of anti-racist behavior is by no means monolithic, I do not mean that only certain kinds of behaviors and only narrow kinds of role models will do. Plural styles of anti-racist behaviors can and should be presented, but there is no gain to including passive or active models of racism just to insure heterogeneity. We do not need more examples of what to avoid.

What kind of institutional base of operations can/do race educators/trainers have? One division is between the internal change agent (a member of the organization undergoing a change program) and the external change agent (a visitor from elsewhere who is temporarily joining the organization in a special capacity). The external change agent who alienates ruling members of a client organization may lose a client

and a fee; the internal agent may lose a job and career. The risks are quite different, and thus so are the behavioral choices. Internal change agents who have worked these issues most effectively generally have had good links to outsiders. . . for information and expertise, for counselling and sympathy and insight in hard times, for testing their own reality, for alternative sources of pressure on supervisors, etc.

The external change agent also may have a variety of different bases of operation, including: (1) a university position; (2) a position in a professional change-making network of organization; (3) a position in an organization or community group committed to the advocacy of social justice; (4) a free lance or self-employed situation. Each of these institutional bases carries its own ideological and economic advantages and risks (Worden, Levin and Chesler, 1976).

One of the most important issues in staffing race education programs is to create time and opportunity for the training staff to share its ideas with one another and with others in the field. All too often programs are generated with such speed that collaboration is difficult. And, the highly autonomous and competitive nature of consulting in this field stands as an additional barrier to effective sharing among educators. There are many ways we can encourage sharing and provide an arena for exchange that do not also engender the dangers of professionalization referred to earlier.

People working in this difficult area will need to gather support from their families and allies, support for

a highly tense and often risky craft. Consultants who operate without these supports often encounter difficulty in maintaining their energy and enthusiasm over time. They experience "burn-out", overwhelming frustration and often despair and withdrawal. In the face of constant marginality with the larger society, solidarity with close allies and comrades is essential. And that closeness is borne not just of similar knowledge and common contacts, but of a sense of struggle. We must find ways to refuel each others' energies, just as we seek to develop the energy and hope of participants in training programs.

We often will have to find support from each other and from referent groups outside many of the systems in which we work. Educators located in federal agencies, military or civilian, face constant rejection and isolation from their peers, from people who are erstwhile targets of race education efforts. The same is true for university personnel, for whom active consultation often is seen as an anti-academic and "activist" pursuit. Race educators in those institutional roles must find support from each other, and must utilize each other to help them withstand isolation, disinterest and even rejection in their own institutions. Thus, the kind of sharing that is important is more than sharing designs or good ideas for training events, or even new analyses of the nature of institutional racism; it includes establishing human supports for a fragile social role.

5. The Contract

Prior to specific program design, the trainer/educator must enter into a contract with the person, group, or organization who commissions and/or legitimizes the program. This is the official client. Targets are those persons or organizations (or parts thereof) who are to be changed.* In some cases the client and the target are the same, as when the members of a club or community group ask for an education program and pay for it themselves (personally or out of their group's funds). But in some cases these two groups may be different, and may need to be dealt with quite differently (see below). Both clients and targets ought to be involved in setting the goals of a education/training program. No one group can establish goals for another and then expect that other group to be committed to or pleased with the outcomes. Such a heirarchial imposition of authority may work well in military or some industrial scenarios, but it simply does not work in voluntary settings such as schools, community organizing efforts, and educational or training programs.** Especially if we think we ought to be involved in a democratization process in race education, or in a broad search for social justice, it is

---

*See, for instance, the simplified listing of different targets or target groups in Table 2 on page 27.

**In fact, much recent commentary on conflict in schools indicates the degree to which student failure may be interpreted as an example of resistance to arbitrarily and unrepresentatively instituted authority.

essential to consider the wide range of interested parties that should be involved in mutual goal setting.

No request for a contract or race education program springs unaided or spontaneously from the minds of potential organizational clients or targets. The environmental conditions predisposing a request may have been promoted by federal guidelines, court actions (especially in the case of school desegregation or affirmative action suits), internal disorder, community demands, etc. But any trainer/educator very likely has to develop a specific market for her/his specific conceptions and abilities regarding race training/education. Internal agents generally must develop a receptivity within the higher reaches of management, in those places with the funds for a program and that can make or implement racial policy for the organization. External change agents often publicize their wares in professional journals and media, through the everpresent word of mouth network, and in various' brochures and memos. Presentations on these subjects at meetings of corporate executives, professional associations and community groups also are effective marketing tactics.

Sometimes contracts are the result of close interpersonal friendships between change agents and clients or target representatives. This is especially likely when the trainer/educator is of the same racial and social status as the client or target representative, and is presumed to share an unspoken communality of interst. Personal relationships

may permit access where none existed before, and thus be a great aid in the marketing process. On the other hand, some patterns of interpersonal loyalty may hamper direct feedback, cloud accountability and suppress important conflicts.

The client approves the program, legitimizes it and authorizes payment. Usually, the staff is in some formal or informal sense accountable to the client (or her/his representative) for work performed. Hopefully, in return, the client is responsible to the staff for providing suitable working conditions (both physical and political). The client may be an individual, a group or unit within an organization, or an entire organizations. "An entire organization" usually means the official representative group in an organization - official authority or management. But there may be other legitimate interest groups or clients within an organization. If we assume that organizations are made up of many different units and classes of members separated by task and status, (and perhaps race and sex and class as well), each with their somewhat different outlooks, priorities, and interests, then we can expect some natural conflicts of interest among them. Alignment with or accountability to any of these groups amounts to partisanship of one form or another, a probably unavoidable situation. It is important to be clear about the actual client because of the problems of accountability, and because it helps clarify whose interests we are supporting and whose we are not.

As I have indicated, the targets of race education/ training may not be the same as the clients. For instance, it is not unusual for the Personnel Department of a large corporation to contract with a training agency to run a training program for line workers or for secondary level supervisory personnel. The targets of training are the direct workers and supervisory personnel. Are they also the clients? No; rather, the Personnel Department is the client. Similarly, the Assistant School Superintendent for Community Relations may contract with a race trainer/educator for a series of in-service workshops for teachers and the principal of a local school. The same division between client and target is evident here.

What kinds of dilemmas develop when the clients and targets or recipients of service are not one and the same? The most potent issue is that clients are not responsible for learning or changing; only the targets or recipients are. When higher level personnel arrange for the training of lower level personnel, the higher level personnel remain buffered from the potential vulnerability of a training situation. I think that contracts of this sort are dangerous because they collude with the ways established authority tries to locate the source of racism in lower level employees and tries to change them rather than themselves.

Such contractual arrangments may also make lower level employees a captive audience or involuntary target for an

education/training program. If powerful whites are not themselves involved in training, we not only have a captive audience, we have a captive audience bound to resent the exercise of superior power that has defined them as the racist problem. In such circumstances, trainers should expect resentment, resistance, apathy, potential withdrawal and attack (See the exchange between: Mill, 1974, and Crowfoot and Chesler, 1975).

Should a trainer/educator work with a captive audience? What can you do about a captive audience's negative reactions? No amount of soft-soaping or sweet-talking will overcome that stance, because resentment, etc., are realistic responses to the arbitrary exercise of superior power. Educators might expect the resistance and ask targets to work with them despite it. Educators might identify with the captives and conduct a program that would discuss the captive-making power of white elites. Or, they might generate a program that requires white elite inclusion. If the captive targets, who do not usually have much power, take control of the program in a way that prepares them to control other aspects of the organization, that may be a very positive outcome. I feel strongly about this issue because my definition of institutional racism suggests that it cannot be effectively countered unless we deal at the same time with problems of white power, and especially elite white power to control subordinate whites as well as minorities.

The educator/trainer may also ask, who is my constituency? On whose behalf am I working? Or, whose interests do I share in this situation? Once again, the constituency to be served may not be the same as the clients who are paying or contracting for the program, nor may they be the same as the target or recipient of training. For instance, I might enter a municipal medical agency to retrain personnel: I might feel that my real constituency is poor people in need of public medical treatment; the recipients of training may not be these poor people - they may be the nurses, doctors and para-professionals in the medical system; the clients who have contracted for the program may be from neither group, but people located in the higher reaches of the medical or community establishment. Race education/training programs often follow this pattern in which white elites are the clients who contract for a program to be run for or on middle level white and/or minority people which the educator/trainer interprets as operating for the eventual benefit of a consituency of poor white and/or minority people.

No constituency exists in the abstract, however. No one should be permitted to say that such and such a program is "for the benefit" of X group unless X group is in some way hooked into the development or monitoring of the program. We have all witnessed teacher training programs that were supposed to benefit students but never did. They didn't partly because students (the eventual recipients of service)

were not involved in designing what was "for their benefit," nor in holding the staff accountable to them for what was done with teachers. Educators wishing to link honestly and successfully to a constituency of this sort generally work in the neighborhood or organization to establish specific accountability before they make a contract with the client and target groups.

All these questions of client, target and constituency suggest a variety of tensions and dilemmas in a contract. Who should control the formal or informal agreements that are made? If different groups want different things. . . or if some group wishes to change its options, who makes those decisions and resolves the conflicts? My view is that we should deal with that pluralistic reality head-on, and have several parties involved in making the contract and in controlling its' performance. Targets, especially, and not just clients, ought to have their views represented (we discuss this issue as part of program design later). But at least in the short run, control rests in the hands of the change agent, because he or she has veto power over whether she or he will perform the requested work. That control does not permit the change agent to demand that a certain program be rammed down others' throats, but it does permit her/him to get out of the way if the terms are offensive.

There are some ocassions, in forthrightly partisan and highly politicized situations, where I would not want to include some targets in the planning of a change program. For instance, consider those situations where we assume that change will only come about through the creation of a major threat to the authority's ability to maintain organizational control (see assumption about change #5, p.25). Such might be the case where recalcitrant management has sabotaged prior education programs, fired consultants and harassed internal advocates of change. It would be foolish to share plans for threat-generation with this person or group ahead of time. I would want to share my plans with a constituency, with local people who know the situation and will benefit or suffer from program outcomes. And I would try to share my plans with the client, at least to the degree that I think she/he is loyal to me and to the constituency, not solely to the organizational authority who is the target of change efforts.

Wending one's way through these potential conflicts is not simply a matter of snappy rhetoric. It requires recognition of the fundamental conflicts of interest between rich and poor, minority and majority, organizational power holders and less powerful members, doctor and patient, teacher and student, professional helper and professional helpee. It requires continuning reflection on one's own values, identity, resources and priorities.

6. Diagnosis

The design of race education/training begins with some relatively implicit or explicit diagnosis of relevant issues. Either trainers/educators have an general diagnosis they apply to the specific situation or they collect local data relevant to the program under consideration. There are several good reasons for beginning each contract with a diagnosis of local individual and/or institutional forces.

1. To provide information that helps the design of programs most suited to the unique needs and capacities and situations of participants.
2. To provide information that can be fed-back into the training program to help everyone deal more concretely with their realistic situation.
3. To provide a benchmark from which later evaluations may assess the degree of change associated with a particular education/training program.

One of the most important considerations involved in assessing racism in the organizational or institutional context is the kind of organization involved. Government agencies are very different from social service or treatment agencies; both are very different from private corporations. Working to reduce racism in a social movement organization committed to social justice is very different than trying the same thing as part of a management development seminar in a government agency. There also is a wide range among

organizations of a roughly similar character.

Although the issues are different in each of these systems, and each does have to be approached with these differences in mind, some common diagnostic foci can be suggested:*

1. Mission or goals. What is the basic purpose of the organization? To what extent is its' basic mission (not just the rhetoric) fundamentally incompatible with racism (e.g. an organization firmly established to fight injustice, to improve equitable health care, etc.)? To what extent is reducing racism incidentally important to the organization because of some internal or external pressure (e.g. need for racial cooperation in order to field good athletic teams, or teamwork of any sort, need to satisfy government or consumer directives or demands)? To what extent is reducing racism basically irrelevant. . . even though interesting. . . to the organization's mission (e.g. to the production of widgets)? And to what extent is reducing racism antithetical to the organization's mission and goals (e.g. explicit or implicit defense of established privileges of race, nationality, etc.)?

*Some interesting and useful beginnings have been made in this direction, with the creation of checklists for easy organizational diagnosis, Situationally specific examples of variables and measures have been generated by: Integrated Education (1971); Nordlie (1974); Sorenson, et.al. (1974).

2. Membership. Who are the people in the organization? What percentages are from what demographic background? Are these same percentages reflected at all levels of the hierarchy? Are there members of all minority groups in the organization, or are some minorities favored more than others? Are minorities in equal number to the numbers of minority people in the community being served by the institution? What is the organization's history with regard to affirmative action programs?

3. Communication patterns. Who is in the communication pattern as a giver or recipient of information? What is the dominant style of exchange - does it reflect one cultural style to the exclusion or disadvantage of others? What opportunities are there for equal status, rewarding and cooperative contacts between organizational members of different races?

4. Power and Decision Making. Who has the power in the organization? Who are the translators or linkers between management and higher level controllers? What are the demographic characteristics of the power wielders? Is the percentage of minority members in powerful positions equal or similar to the percentages of minority members in the total organization? Or in the community being served? Are these percentages different for influence than

for power or authority (or for informal v. formal power)? What styles for using power are most common or preferred in the organization - are they monocultural or pluralistic (do only cool and reserved white upper class styles prevail, or is only male macho leadership seen as effective, etc.)? How do decision-making teams interact with one another? What kinds of skills, talents, resources, are required for people to move to positions of organizational power? Are there any ways in which the informal criteria for mobility work in ways that are racist?

5. Reward system. Who are the primary recipients of organizational rewards? Are whites receiving a greater share of monetary rewards, prizes and other benefits? How is profit or gain distributed among members? Are there any rewards available for explicitly anti-racist programs, policies, or behaviors? What are organizational norms about "appropriate" and "inappropriate" behavior with regard to racial relations? Are racist behaviors identified and punished, or disapproved? Are rules and regulations fair to all members? Do organizational members of various racial groups perceive rule implementation to be fair?

6. Opportunities for growth. What kinds of programs does the organization have to promote the personal

education and growth of members? Are internal programs oriented to enhancing opportunities for economic mobility? Are such programs open to, and designed to attract, minority members? What kinds of anti-racism programming has occurred before?

7. Production or service evaluation. Especially in human service organizations, are the services equally available to all racial groups? Do members of various racial groups perceive there to be equity in service delivery (health care, schooling, garbage pickup, recreational funds, community cultural programming)? In material production organizations, are the materials or goods produced equally responsive to the cultural styles and preferences of various racial groups? Are they equally accessible and attractive to groups with varying resources?

8. Linkage to the community. How does the organization relate to issues or racism in the community? Does it attend to such issues, take a leadership role, duck them, etc? What kind of resources are made available for such efforts? Is there any mechanism for broadly-based community input?

9. History of reactions to change efforts. When change programs of various kinds were generated, what happened to them? What organizational positions are held by ex-holders of the office you are dealing with?

Has top mamangement supported or subverted change programs previously? What risks accompany active change-agentry in this system (spying, harassment, job threats, non-promotion, defamation - are all possible and have happened in some places)?

There are several ways such diagnotic information can be gathered. Organizational records and files represent a key source with regard to personnel data, productivity and profit, and long term performance. The observation of behavior and organizational activities is another means, as is the conduct of interviews, surveys or conversations with people in various organizational roles and positions. Special events can be held to highlight certain issues and provide an arena for more data-gathering (conferences, pilot training sessions, etc.).

In addition to an organizational diagnosis, we can also conduct a diagnosis of individuals' issues relevant to race education/training. As indicated, attitudinal reports on survey questionnaires are not necessarily reliable predictors of behavior. Neither are lengthy personal conversations or group discussions. But they all are interesting as reflections of attitudinal racism. Another possibility, of course, is to gather data on individual performance or behavior itself.

Among the diagnostic foci for individuals could be:*

*These variables are all potential components of individual racism. They represent personal characteristics relevant to assumptions about change based on the role of information, psychological fears and prejudices, interpersonal contact, and self-interest. In assessing the potential for individual attitudinal change, Katz(1960) argues persuasively for understanding the functional role attitudes play for individuals, and then keying change programs to these roles. His insightful article is relevant both to this list and to the discussion that follows.

a. Degree of psychological comfort or security

b. Sense of self-esteem

c. Attitudinal prejudice

d. Behavior toward minorities

e. Behavior toward whites different from self (religion, nationality, age, sex)

f. Interactions with whites around racial issues and events

g. Perception of self-interest in racial matters

h. Willingness to change

i. Potential for taking risks

j. Knowledge of one's own ethnic and racial heritage

k. Understandings of racism's mechanisms

l. Potential for influencing others

What is probably most important to assess at the individual level is the degree to which people feel motivated to increase their racial awareness. If people are so motivated, why? What is their stake in change? In the section, Assumptions about Change, I suggested several bases for white self-interest in change around racial relations. One of these is simply an altruistic concern about human betterment and fulfillment of egalitarian and social justice values. A second is a survival-oriented concern to stay alive in the face of potential threat and conercion. Closely related is the desire to develop new competencies in interracial relations,

either to maintain status or to gain marketable new skills as a device for enhancing upward mobility. A third is an enlightened form of self-interest that suggests that people understand the connectedness between the welfare of large numbers of poor people and minorities and their own long run welfare. Understanding and connecting to the nature of whites' self-interest in changing is a key to effective program design.

Sometimes these motivations may be well hidden, and sometimes they may disguise other objectives. Hidden agendas ought to be expected, especially when there is substantial coercion or pressure on targets to be part of a training program. Under these circumstances, a persons real objectives may have more to do with looking good to supervisors, or picking up information on subordinates and peers, than in goals of race awareness itself.* For some of these reasons, it may be well not to trust formal diagnosis that relies only on self-reports of conditions or motivations. Short pilot workshops or mini-training events may permit the change agent to assess persons' and organizations' real intents directly, while at the same time providing others with an example of her/his own working focus and style.

---

*These are not motivations to ignore, scoff at or disparage. In fact, they should be expected and taken advantage of, as in generating visible support from authorities for education programs, and in protecting participants from others' exploitation. All possible motivations for change ought to be appealed to in this general race education effort.

7. Designing Programs

The design and focus of a specific program are closely related to the goals of any change effort. Since the client group most often sets the parameters within which programs goals are discussed, most program goals are derived from the interests of powerful client elements in an organization being served. In addition, the values or orientations of the educator/trainer and the needs or interest of a target group have impact. And, finally, the information gained in a diagnosis may give change agent, client or even target group a better base from which to consider their own and their organization's investment and perspective in a race education/training program.

Whatever its ultimate content, the design must be appealing to the constituency or client-target groups in an organization. If multiple constituencies are being served, the design should appeal to each and all of them. In many cases the appealing nature of the program itself may capture the attention of organizational targets, regardless of other personal or institutional motivating factors. This notion of broad appeal is in sharp contrast to those designs which self-consciously or not alienate everyone but the most avowedly anti-racist constitutency. If that were our only constituency, we ought not to be advertising within mainstream institutions. It also contrasts with those designs which suppress all hint of conflict in the attempt to soothe

and entertain personnel committed to the status quo. Such a constituency may not yet be ripe for even the limited changes possible in an education program. The attempt to appeal beyond those two limited groups promises the greatest change for the future, and stresses the need for attractive program design and marketing.

Many different designs for individual, interpersonal or institutional change all can be legitimate and appropriate, regardless of the status level or race of persons involved in training. However, racial and status characteristics do affect the designs selected. I indicated this principle in Table 2 on page 27, and can elaborate those issues somewhat here. Minority groups and whites may not have common change goals, and thus not common learning agenda; they each may need different information and skills. For instance, it may be most important for whites to learn how to prepare to share power and control; and it may be most important for blacks or browns to learn how to organize to take power; all may need to learn how to collaborate with one another, but in very different ways. Blacks and browns or other minorities may need special help in making a coalition with one another, the better to confront white power with a united front. And whites of different status, located in different communities or in different parts of an organization, experience different realities and have different needs and options. The same may well be true of people who already have different levels of

racial awareness (see definitions on page 8-9).

If minorities and whites are participants in a training program together, how should they relate? Designs can promote heterogeneous groupings which educate minorities and whites together. Or, they can promote homogenous groupings, where whites and minorities meet separately - either for part or all of the program. It is clear that whites behave differently in an all or predominantly white group than in a group with a substantial number of minority people (or vice versa), and we ought to plan with that in mind. The resolution of this design dilemma rests in part on judgements of the actual differences in various participants' goals and needs, and in part on the assumptions made about "contact." If all the conditions have not been met, heterogenous activities are most likely to duplicate patterns of existing white power and to use minority people solely as resources for whites' acquisition of information.

Several issues in the timing of educational events are relevant in program design efforts. Events begun in the midst or just after a crisis carry the disadvantage of appearing merely crisis-relevant, and thus losing attr ctiveness when a crisis subsides. Events which are built into the organization's own time frame, that do not interfere with production schedules, emergency community events, or well known and revered deadlines, stand the best chance of being integrated

into the ongoing life of the organization and its members. Clearly the various components of an overall program should fit together in some logical sequence: at the least that requires a diagnostic phase, followed by exploratory work, which leads to full scale training and then evaluation. In practice, however, many different kinds of sequences may make sense.

Part of the specific decision about sequence depends on whether the training/education program is conceived and planned as a short run affair or a long run endeavor. It is one shot, several sessions, or operating over time? Some argue we can assess an organization's commitment to change by virtue of its investment in long term rather than short term programs. But that does not mean that short term programs are meaningless. They may reach limited goals and also help identify problems and resources that are available if people wish to follow up. But clearly, preknowledge about the potential length of the overall education/training program is essential in preparing a design.

Knowledge about the investment in and length of a training/education program has important implications for decisions about how to handle conflict in the program setting. Given the nature of race relations in the American society, and given the added nature of authority and control in most large bureaucratic organizations, I would expect to see issues of racial and organizational (and probably sexual and social

class) conflict lying beneath the surface of the"temporary system" we call the training/education program. It would be foolish to think that the program could be isolated from these circumstances, or that people would drop these latent roles and their conflicts in order to learn. Nor should we try to avoid them! In fact, they can be used as part of the substance as well as the basic energy of learning. In a short program, however, I would be concerned about how much of this material to surface directly since it takes time and hard work to make positive gains. In a longer program, I would surely uncover and work with them, since I think their exploration is crucial for any meaningful change. Of course, under any conditions trainers/educators may not be able to control this issue; these conflicts may surface without our uncovering them and then we must work with them.

Another major issue in program design is the degree to which participants are to be isolated from their everyday experiences and environments. Some educators/trainers argue that a degree of isolation and a different environment is required for people to unhook and unfreeze from past behaviors; they promote a residential setting for training. Others suggest that change ultimately takes place in the home environment and changes occurring elsewhere are illusory; they prefer either to conduct training at-the-elbow in the work or community settings, or to bring units of people who work together into the residential training situation. Whichever way

we resolve this question, unless people hook learnings to the organizational and interpersonal situations in which they exist, any changes occurring will be harder to sustain.

What are the most appropriate mechanisms for training? Obviously there are myriad possibilities, but what are the key issues? One is the degree of balance between information and experience, between intellectual and emotional confrontations. Undoubtedly most whites need new information - about their society and its history, about their own views, and about the relationships among varied forms of injustice. Just as clearly, they need new emotional insights and experiences that unfreeze old ideas, imbalance stable habits and create the tension and conflict so critical for real learning. Among the variety of informational media are lectures, films, books, and other materials and group discussions. Media tuned more to emotional issues include interpersonal encounters, structured group exercises, reflection or meditation activities, sensitivity training groups, simulated and role play activities, realistic problem-solving for change in the home environment, etc. Research seems to indicate typical information-educational programs have little impact (Katz, 1976), at least not unless they are accompanied by other experiences. At the same time, emotional encounters may prove too intense, and raise rather than lower defenses. Perhaps the underlying message is that different people learn differently, and that we need to attend to this plural reality carefully.

One important design component referred to earlier is the use of diagnostic data as a stimulus to learning. Feedback models are popular elements of organizational change programs (Mann, 1962; Miles, et. al. 1960; Nadler, 1976; Sedlacek and Brooks, 1973), and they have powerful utility in individually oriented programs as well (Winecoff and Kelly 1969). They permit reorientation to the realities of participants' everyday organizational experience, and thus help to bridge the gap between the "back home" reality and the "isolation" reality of the training/education program setting.

What place in a training/education program should be taken up by attempts to portray role models of good interracial working relations? Many people learn by observing others whom they respect model new behaviors, and this learning paradigm represents a useful program element (Weissbach, 1976). In role playing scenarios, in simulations, and in the behavior of the staff, new and more racially just behavior patterns can be portrayed.

It is also important to provide access to credible and highly prestigious experts in the field of race education. There are at least two different reasons for this priority: (1) these prestigious experts may have specific insights and information helpful to individuals or to the organization; (2) given the controversial and often precarious nature of race education, it is important to think of even cosmetic ways of raising its credibility in the eyes of targets, clients and organizational members. I am not suggesting duplicity or chicanery; just reminding us all of the relevance of public relations in any program, and of the use of any and all positive forces we can muster.

Vigorous and continuous endorsement by top executives and organizational managers can help remind everyone of the high priority the program has for the organization itself. This can not be accomplished by the mere window dressing act of having a highly placed authority come to a kick-off dinner and then fade (perhaps only to appear for the closing benediction). Everyone can see the minimal level of commitment truly indicated by such a step. But endorsement that takes the form of active involvement in events, that demonstrates a caring for the outcomes, that puts some resources on the line in important ways, can have a significant effect. The program design should make provision for public attention to such acts. Failing to garner such resources, program designers must question anew their reading of organizational leaders' commitment to the program.*

One of the continuing problems of program design is how to involve organizational authorities who may not be enthusiastic, but who have the power to kill or support a program. One option is to exclude them, and to keep them ignorant of all but planned positive messages that can be sent their way. Another limited option is to include them in a symbolic manner in the program, giving endorsements in the form of introductory and closing benedictions and maybe a talk on the reality of

---

*As I note later, lack of leadership commitment does not necessarily doom a program; to the contrary, it may aid some kinds of programs. But to the extent the organization's leadership is considered critical to success, it should be sought out, commitments garnered, and endorsements presented.

organizational life. A third option is to include them fully as participants, subject to the same risks and growth opportunities as everyone else. This problem can not be dealt with fruitfully if it is abstracted from the other assumptions of the training design. What else has been decided about dealing with organizational power and control? What else has been decided about heterogeneous or homogenous grouping with respect to task and status level? What else has been decided about examining internal conflict within the organization?

To the extent that internal conflict and control are part of the program's explicit or implicit agenda (and I have noted how varying educators may legitimately differ on such questions), participation might be uncomfortable and unproductive for a single representative of organizational authority. Several of them participating as a group might be better for everybody. If the overall change strategy requires covert relationships between the educator and organizational authority, then it makes sense to exclude them from the program and make sure they receive only carefully screened information. If the overall strategy is one of openness, then they can receive full information via participation, access to evaluations, or debriefing.

When does all this designing and planning of events occur? And who does it? No matter how much design work is done ahead of time (and I urge that), there always are emergent

issues in a training program. Thus, continual design change always will be necessary, and the staff must be alert to diagnosing and acting flexibly on new learner needs. One way to insure this flexibility and openness is to create procedures whereby targets can participate in program design and re-design. Such procedures can increase the possiblity of reaching participants' real needs as well as introducing greater democratic authority into the trainer-oriented program scenario.

Some of the possibilities raised in this section on the design of race education/training programs can be reviewed in Table 3 (See page 63). Here we can consider how various training modes or tactics fit with alternative awareness goals, those outcomes presented originally on page 8 - 9. The first 4-5 tactics are largely information oriented, the next 4-5 are substantially emotion oriented, and the last4-5 heavily action-planning in orientation (of course there is overlap). For each of these categories, many specific exercises exist.

Different training/education tactics will be more or less appropriate or useful for each of these sets of goals or outcomes; some have mutliple utility. Written and audio-visual materials about race relations, for instance, may be most pertinent to outcomes of new information. These same materials may not be quite so useful for outcomes of new change roles and activities, but presentations of theories and strategies of change might be. Sensitivity/encounter

Table 3

Designs and Goals

Training/Education Tactics or Modes	Awareness Goals/Outcomes: New Information	New Attitudes & Values	New Personal Behaviors	New Change Activities	New Change Roles & Programs
1. Written materials					
2. Audio-visuals					
3. Experts' lectures					
4. Authoritative endorsement & exhortation					
5. Discussion groups - racially homogeneous or heterogeneous					
6. Value clarification					
7. Sensitivity/ Encounter groups					
8. Role playing & simulations					
9. Feedback of local data (personal or organizational)					
10. Problem-solving groups					
11. Firm support teams					
12. Plan back-home change					

groups and role playing/simulations are examples of more emotionally intensive tactics. By themselves, exercises of this sort may create overload; when blended with the information-based tactics they may be very powerful in affecting changes in attitudes or behavior. Tactics of data feedback and team problem-solving or planning are essential for attaining outcomes related to active change roles. Without these elements, the program design maintains a sole focus on individual learning, not explicitly connected to the back-home or organizational settings. When colleagues who work together plan together, they can start to support new behaviors, roles and change activities.

No one knows the most appropriate mix of tactics, nor exactly which tactics (and all their subparts in particular) will work best for which outcomes. But the various combinations of tactics should be planned in terms of our experiences and guesses about their relevance for our unique program goals.

8. Conditions for On-Going Personal Change

I have stressed the primary utility of race education/training as a device for opening the possibilities for individual change on racial matters. But it doesn't always work, it doesn't always lead to changed attitudes. And even if it does, then what? We are all familiar with attitude changes or good intentions that fail to be realized in new behaviors. And we are all familiar with new behaviors that

fail to be sustained over time. Let us consider both these issues in some detail, because there is no point to a "good" program design if it fails at these levels of implementation over time. Under what conditions will personal changes initiated during a race education/training program be translated into behavior and action that is maintained over time?

The first question is how we can facilitate new attitudes being translated into new behaviors, rather than staying at the level of new intellective discourse or emotive insight. One useful step would involve helping program participants look at various behaviors, and to analyze them in terms of their racism, thus to understand what behaviors may be associated with new and less racist (or anti-racist) attitudes. It has been my experience that many people, myself included, have been surprized at times to discover the racism inherent in actions and behaviors we once thought were absolutely inoffensive. Many of us now have learned about the passive racism entailed in white reluctance to confront other whites' racism, in the endless desire to listen to minorities explain their situation, in the patronizing gesture of "some of my best friends are", or "do you all. . .". One step on the road to anti-racist behavior is the understanding of what behaviors may be associated with anti-racist attitudes, so as to fill the vacuum left by the recognition and elimination of racist behaviors. Another useful activity in this regard

might well be to role play a variety of situations, interactions between whites and minorities,* or among whites. The examination of specific situations helps provide the behavioral cues program participants can build off in their own efforts at new behaviors. Throughout this discussion I have made the assumption that racist behavior may persist even when racist attitudes have been altered; one reason may be that whites have not yet learned what constitutes non-racist behavior.**

The second question is in many ways even more interesting. . . under what conditions can changes initiated during a race education program be maintained over time? One of the most important conditions for changes to persevere is constant reinforcement and support for new behaviors from other persons. . . family members, friends, co-workers, peers, etc. People who know the changes being undertaken and who encourage individuals to practice changed behavior back on the job, in the family, etc., can be very useful. Many research findings stress the potent effects of

---

*Several minorities preferably, because the issues are somewhat different in white interactions with blacks as compared with Chicanos, or Native-peoples or Asian-Americans. In fact, one element of racism is evident in the ready assumption that all minorities are alike, and that what is non-racist behavior vis-a-vis blacks is also non-racist behavior vis-a-vis Chicanos. Not true!

**As indicated previously, although the attitude-behavior link is interesting and important, it is not all important. Intentions or attitudes are only one part of the puzzle, and re-education or confrontation of behavioral racism can occur with or without attention to"underlying" attitudes.

the peer group and peer norms on the possibility of behavior change (Ewens and Erlich, 1972; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Pettigrew, 1959).

However, one of the complex issues in the relationship between the individual and her/his peer group is that each person may belong to several peer groups, and these groups may have different effects on her/his behavior. For instance, Dashevsky (1976) reports on a series of early studies wherein white workers evidenced considerable acceptance of blacks as co-workers and co-union members, but did not generally accept them as neighborhood members.*

One way to work on these issues is to make the individual's peer groups (or referent groups) a focus of concern in the race education program. Not only can the program help people examine the norms of groups to which they belong, but it also could highlight processes of conflict and compromise the person must cope with in living among these diverse groups. To the extent people can share the dilemmas and binds they experience in such peer settings, they may be able to adopt more aggressive and initiating stances toward peer norms. Another approach is to create new peer groups within a training/education program. Sustained contact and collaboration within supportive norms could be the

---

*Similar findings have been reported by Musick (1974), in his study of the variations in white working class peoples' attitudes toward racial issues in neighborhood, school and workplace.

beginning of new patterns of later association and exchange.

In addition to interpersonal supports, a second condition for ongoing change is institutional and organizational supports that can reinforce the changes initiated in an awareness program (Buchanan, 1967; Schmuck, 1968). Rewards such as increased salary, public attention, or new tasks and new roles may be very meaningful motivators for change. So may organizational norms or policies that promote social justice, and definitions of "appropriate" behavior that include anti-racist actions. Many reports of school desegregation, for instance, have stressed the importance of active and forthright leadership by the superintendent and school board (Crain, 1968; United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1976).

Positive reinforcement is meaningful, no doubt, but so is negative reinforcement. Thus, an important feature of the organizational reward structure could be negative sanctions or punishments for non-changed behavior or for racist actions or policies. The organization could withhold raises, promotions and privileges for members who do not alter their personal racist behavior, or for supervisors who do not alter racist structures within their corporate units, work groups, classrooms, or agency subsections. As Triandis has argued, we must "create institutional arrangements in which exploitative behaviors are no longer reinforced (quoted in Katz, 1976, p. 8)".

A third major condition for on-going personal change is for the lessons of the education/training program to be linked to the individual's own conception of his or her self-interest with regard to race relations.* It is highly unlikely people will behave in ways they feel are at variance with their own welfare. Thus, many abstract concerns about morality, democratic behavior, egalitarianism, or social justice simply are not acted out in practice. This gap between abstract moral values and self-interested action is "The American Dilemma." It may be a product of accurate information about one's welfare, or inaccurate information spurred by ignorance, myth, habit, ingrained assumptions or acceptance of the status quo. New patterns of organizational rewards certainly might alter individual self-interest, and pave the way for new behaviors. But if the education/training program has presented only a series of moral imperatives, not linked to new forms of self-interest, then this condition simply cannot be met.

One way such links may be made is if a program helps people distinguish between "immediate advantages" and "long range advantages." The obvious advantages middle class whites

---

*I referred earlier to the alteration of perceived self-interest as one of the major assumptions (# 4 on p. 22-25) about how change occurs, and to Katz' (1960) insightful discussion or the psychic functions of attitudes, especially to some attitudes' instrumental function in helping the individual achieve or sustain material and symbolic status and security.

feel in maintaining their own position of privilege vis-a-vis blacks and other minority people can be compared to the ways such privilege may doom minorities and the majority to an eventual holocaust of social crisis and disorder. In the long-range view, white self-interest of a survival character may help bring about change in race relations. A program might also analyze structures of social privilege, so as to help white working class and middle class people understand how their own self-interests are wedded to the reduction of power and privilege controlled by white elites. New behaviors resulting from those changed perceptions could alter racism.

To summarize, there seem to be several ways in which an education program might demonstrate to whites some of the advantages or payoffs to them of adopting new behaviors around race relations: (1) by stressing the relationship between new behaviors and valued organizational outcomes, such as increased profit or quality of services, or increased stability in its internal environment; (2) by stressing the relationship between new behaviors and organizational rewards that might take the form of promotions to higher status, greater pay, special recognition, etc.; (3) by stressing the relationship between new behaviors and one's self-esteem as a member of a democratic community; (4) by stressing the relationship between new behaviors and the reduction of those tensions (and perhaps guilts) that accompany the

feeling of sitting on top of a social powder keg; (5) by stressing the relationship between new behaviors and the ability to gain rewards now monopolized by a small group of higher status whites (lower taxes, control of opportunities, leisure, etc.). These various forms of demonstrable self-interest mirror the kinds of resources discussed in the section Assumptions about social change. To the extent they guide race education programs they may help make them more effective in appealing to whites' rational sense of the payoffs of change. To the extent they are demonstrated to be effective in an education program they may actually help motivate and maintain change. To the extent that organizations really can gain and payoff in terms of new rewards for groups and individuals, new racial behaviors may be maintained over time.

In addition to support and reinforcement from persons and organizations, community support in the form of new laws, governmental policy and neighborhood development activities is the fourth way we could encourage greater individual efforts to reduce racism. Some environmental supports may be generated within the training/education setting itself, if people from the same community setting are present together. They could use the program as a base for planning political action to alter their community environment.

9. Links to Organizational Change

A central question for all concerned with altering the

racist character of American society is what will happen if our race education/training programs are successful? If changes in individual racism such as we have been discussing do occur and are maintained, what then? Can changed persons make a difference in traditional organizations and in the traditional society? Or are all our efforts futile if they begin and end with attempts at changing individuals?

These are critical questions, and in their answers rests any final justification for race education/training. For racism is not a temporary social problem, nor an aberration on the otherwise just and fair American landscape, nor simply a problem in our minds and hearts. Racism is a deeply rooted part of our entire national-international structure; our current economic and political systems maintain it (some say require it for stability) and our culture justifies it. Unless institutional and community practices are altered, we will not be able to alter the racially unequal distribution of economic, political and social resources and rewards - the "effects or outcomes" noted in definition #1 on page 3. There are two reasons for this argument: (1) as I suggested in the prior section, individual changes will not occur, or if they occur they will not be sustained, without corollary institutional change and support; and (2) the most pernicious and egregious aspects of racial inequality and injustice in this society are not amenable to alternation via individual action. . . they are part of the structures and norms of

major institutions and communities, and change will take place only when those social systems themselves change. Thus, institutional and community changes must occur if racism is to be countered in any serious way. How can this occur?

Although psychological thought and research often promotes the idea that individuals initiate changes that then flow into organizations, most of the more macro social sciences take a different view. Change begins with new kinds of institutions or new kinds of societies, and the character of organizational life determines the nature of individual options. The organization of rewards and self-interest perspectives, the control patterns of major organizations, the highly rountinized socialization of individuals, and the availability of certain ideological or cultural belief systems, all determine the eventual direction of individual and societal behavior. Thus, changes in individual racial attitudes develop as a result of institutional changes, not as a precursor of them. What does this mean for us? At most, it suggests that if we lack the power and skill and will to change the organizations and communities in which we work and play, all our other training/education programs are wasteful distractions. At least, it suggests chat a focus on organizational change must be part of race craining/education programs. But not included just to help sustain individual changes; included because that is where work must be done for important things to happen, regardless of individual change.

Several principles of organizational life can be examined in the attempt to address these issues. First, all organizations are interdependent with their external environment. If they are functioning effectively and properly within the racist American society, they carry within them institutional racism (and sexism and class discrimination as well).* If this were not true, those organizations would be markedly deviant from the rest of the society, doing things in ways that stood counter to the dominant racist orientations of most of our social life.

Second, all organizations are fairly well coordinated, held together in one of two principle forms. Voluntary organizations usually are held together by the common agreement of people who work together for some superordinant purpose that pleases them all. Trust, in each other and authority, is common. However, most of us spend most of our time in non-voluntary organizations, and they are not dependent upon every individual's agreement to work together for common ends. They are held together by our need for them (employment, vital services ,etc.), and the ability of certain groups within the organization to manufacture rules and regulations and to exercise control over others' behavior. Trust is not nearly as important in non-voluntary organizations, nor

---

* As indicated in the section of this paper dealing with Diagnosis, local data reflecting this phenomenon can be collected.

is it a common feature of members' relation to authority.

The establishment and exercise of institutional power is critical in helping any organization perform its functions, integrate diverse subgroup or individual tasks, monitor output, and the like. If institutional authority supports and maintains racism, it is going to be very difficult to change the organization without altering that managerial power.

Third, all organizations are vulnerable to reorganization of their external or internal environments. No matter how stable and secure an organization appears, the power it maintains is a negotiable social quality, dependent upon the predictability, stability and control of human and material resources. Alterations in raw material inputs (labor, energy, materials) in internal conditions (division of labor, orderly interactions, morale, efficiency), or in the output system (consumer markets, profits, services or products delivered) will require adaptations and changes in the organization itself.

A central proposition for organizational change is that the character of power in or on organizations must change for any alteration to be lasting.* Some people argue that the reorganization of power proceeds only by getting top management support for certain kinds of changes. They point out that

---

*This topic, altering organization or institutional racism, is simply too complex to be addressed in detail here; it deserves separate and extended treatment. But since it is critical, even this short statement of the issues may be useful.

top management represents the legitimate ruling mechanism in the organization; thus it is neither proper nor effective to procede without top management support. Such approaches usually stress "organizational development" as a way to redress the internal power domains. Training programs often are integrated with a continuing series of data gathering and problem solving activities, all oriented toward intra-organizational collaboration and multi-level participation for change. This approach is most consistent with my assumption #1 about how change occurs, an appeal to the consensual interests and democratic values of ruling groups (see p. 18-19).

Others, who perceive top management as only one of several partisan groups in an organization, are quite prepared to create a challenge if top management does not support anti-racist objectives. Their approach often involves organizing from below, with large numbers of lower or middle-level personnel trying to generate the power to alter management practice and re-allocate power. They also may organize from the outside, trying to mobilize external power sources to affect the direction and state of internal organizational arrangements. Training programs often lead to or are integrated with preparations for consumer boycotts, product sabotage, withholding of key raw materials and labor, public exposure, and legal suit or injunctive action. Our recent history, particularly with regard to environmental rather than racial issues, is replete with examples of community

groups developing information and mass energy that renders major public or private agencies vulnerable to change. This approach is most consistent with my assumptions 4 and 5 about how change occurs, an effort to alter the perceived self-interests of ruling groups and to mobilize oppressed groups to generate threats (see pp. 22-26).

In addition to the alteration of organizational power directly, organizational goals, conflict handling mechanisms, communication systems, reward structures and boundary mechanisms, all represent other possible targets for change. Only a good diagnosis of institutional racism will guide us to all these places in an organization, and inform us which represents the most appropriate target.

If a race education/training program begins to threaten the organization's concept of its own welfare, or the welfare of ruling groups, it can be expected that attempts will made to eliminate the program or its creators and agents. O'Day (1974) and Leeds (1969) have eloquently described several forms of resistance or opposition organizational leaders utilize in the effort to evade, buffer or suppress changes. They range, quite naturally, from the attempt to ignore an innovative program, and to withhold important resources from it, to attempts to buy off change agents by inviting them and their minor reforms into management ranks. Attempts to intimidate or scare off change agents may include isolating them from their constituency, or changing their job or job location

via transfer. And, finally, if these other attempts fail, one can defame the character and intentions of the change agent, and exclude her/him from the organization (via firing, contract termination, extra-legal harassment and perhaps legal action or arrest for promoting disorder).

There is no sure means of survival in this kind of situation. One way, of course, is to stay out of trouble. . . if we make sure not to threaten the basic interests of people who govern or manage major organizations, then there will be no need to survive serious counterattack. Presumably, that line of reasoning explains the vast number of race education/training programs that have been primarily conflict pacification or basic information efforts, rather than "anti-racism" undertakings. But if we do elect to become fully aware of, and take action on, the serious problems of racism that lie at the heart of white organizational self-interest, the basic resource needed for protection is a power base. I want to be realistic in repeating that there is considerable risk; but I also want to be realistic in indicating that there are ways of mediating these risks. Several different kinds of power may help us be invulnerable, or at least protected against being knocked off: high standing in the community or organization; good links with friends in top management; substantial and mobilizable support in the minority community (constituency) inside or outside the agency or organization; sensitive information about people and/or

policies; links to news agencies which might publish stories of internally racist politics; etc.

Several important program design elements can be re-stated as critical in either the top-down or bottom-up approach to linking education/training to organizational change. One is the use of participants' time to do back-home planning for how they may create changes in their organization while they are working on changes in themselves. A second mode is to generate information and data feedback mechanisms that can provide specific local assessments of institutional performance on anti-racism agendas. A third mode would use participants' time to estalish caucus or problem solving groups which generate new patterns of interaction among whites, or among minorities, or even among members of potential interracial coalitions within the organization. Upon return to the organizational environment, these new forms of homogenous or heterogeneous consciousness raising groups or political action caucuses could undertake change. They can also be support groups to help identify, overcome or mediate risks. Finally, if power in the hands of whites usually also means that power narrowly represents other elite interests (males, affluent people, etc.), education/training designs can include building internal-external coalitions of the powerless who can challenge the narrow racial, sexual and class base of institutional power.

10. Links to Community movements for change

I have asserted that all organizations (and individuals

as well) exist and operate within a local community context. Thus, it seems appropriate to discuss the impact this context may have on the possibilities of personal and organizational change. Perhaps even more importantly, I want to suggest some of the ways in which active community based movements for social change can be a helpful resource in altering and eradicating institutional racism.

I do not believe it is possible to make and sustain major alterations in individuals' lives without altering the embracing set of social relationships that individuals experience in the organizations and communities of which they are a part. This belief necessitated the section of this paper titled Conditions for ongoing personal change . To go further, I do not believe it is possible to make and sustain changes in organizational structures and operations without altering the embracing set of community conditions in which the organization operates. Organizational change programs which ignore this assumption most often treat the organization as if it exists in a vacuum. And, those programs usually make only minor and temporary changes, ones not related to community resources, power and values.

If we accept these assertions about organizational change we would expect our best bets to exist in those circumstances wherein community movements to counter racism are already underway, or can be initiated prior to an education program. Then these change-oriented community movements can

lend energy and other resources helpful to the organizational change effort. Institutional racism, after all, exists in the community as well as the organization; whichever comes first, both must occur for lasting change to happen.

There are several ways in which community based movements for change can be helpful in the effort to alter institutional racism. First, they may set the stage by identifying institutional racism as a "problem," by raising this issue to the level of public awareness where it must be dealt with. In some cases, this merely has meant drawing public attention to obvious or newly visible conditions or indicators of injustice. In other cases it has involved generating the power that turns a "condition" into a notable "problem," typically by creating a turmoil or threat that commands attention.* One reaction to this problem recognition may be for the organization or community to call for a consultant on race education to help them prepare a change program.

When it appears that a program of race education might get underway, an active community group may also be helpful in legitimating that program or the staff members involved. I referred earlier to the problems consultants often have in maintaining clarity about their clients, targets and constituencies.

---

*Something like the apocryphal story of the farmer who whacked his mule on the side of the head with a 2 x 4 in order to draw his attention to the need to get moving and to follow his more gentle sweet talking or pressure on the reins. The social process by which a condition becomes a problem is well detailed by Ross and Staines' (1972).

If a consultant on race education can establish links with a constituency group in the community she or he may be better able to gain alternative perspectives on the program and the organization with which she or he is working. In addition, such a constituency might help protect her or him from organizational resistance to change efforts. . . and the potential of destructive organizational counter-attack.

This is an especially important safeguard when the consultant is from out-of-town, and therefore lacks sophisticated information about the local community history and context of educational programs. In the case of internal change agents, such linkage to community groups and active pressure groups also is an essential resource. The twin issues are the same: (1) maintaining contact with an alternative, non-organizational social reality that may help counter organizational brainwashing or socialization efforts; and (2) maintaining contact with an alternative power base that may help when resistance and conflict are high.

Community based social movement groups may also be able to play helpful roles at those stages when ongoing monitoring or organizational change efforts becomes important. Long-term monitoring defies the time-energy demands of most external consultants, and may also occupy too much of the internal agent's attention, distracting her or him from initiating new programs. Such monitoring could be turned over to stable community groups who have an interest in anti-racism programming, and who may have the time and energy to watchdog this organization over time.

Finally, if organizational change is inextricably tied to community change, an active community based movement may help set the community conditions for ongoing change in race relations. As the community itself becomes more "aware" of race relations' issues, and more commited to working for racial justice (for whatever reasons. . . good will and moral commitments, fear and threat, enlightened self-interest) organizational change efforts may also become easier.

11. Evaluation

It is important to conduct periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of race education/training programs. When done well, they can help insure that evaluators, program designers, and clients can specify their goals and objectives in ways that permit discovering whether any progress has been made. Formative evaluations can be done in the midst of a program, and they can help re-direct or reorganize training that may be missing its mark. Final evaluations can provide an end-of-the-road assessment of the general effectiveness of programs.

Periodic and repeated evaluations also can provide a continuing diagnostic assessment of the state of individual or organizational racism. These data can then be used as a stimulus for further change; evaluative data not fed back into the organization to continue the promotion of change represent a lost opportunity. But feeding back evaluation data often encounters some of the same problems any intervention entails. In schools, for instance, administrators

want control of the data; they want to screen it and present it to teachers, students and community members. It is essential for this information to be democratized - to be made available to all organizational participants - in a language and style they can understand and use. Otherwise, the evaluative-feedback process passively serves only one party's interests in a plural organization-usually managerial interests.

Furthermore, evaluations may insure that no one is fooling anyone about just how much munificent change around race relations may or may not be happening. All too often, white Americans, with some help from minorities, have pronounced themselves pleased with the state of progress around race relations only to discover that there has been no progress after all. Sometimes change agents and organizational managers collude to insure a positive evaluation, regardless of real programmatic outcomes. The program is pronounced a success, the change agent's reputation is enhanced, organizational leaders can announce they have done a good thing, and everyone is pleased. But why are they pleased? Has any change occurred? Everyone who was part of a training/education program ought to be part of the evaluation effort, and evaulative efforts ought to be done in ways that promote, not inhibit, more change.

The attempt to evaluate programs as if political neutrality was possible, as if political pressures for success

or failure did not exist, is probably fruitless. But there are some safeguards that can help in this process: (1) evaluations may be conducted by third parties, ones not connected to trainers/educator's interests or to clients' interests, or at least not connected directly; and (2) evaluations can be made public so all parties can respond to them. I prefer the second path because I am doubtful of the possibilities of even third party neutrality.* In my work within a university I see many allegedly neutral scientists and program evaluators who have implicitly accepted the frames of reference proposed by organizational managers, and by the loosely knit interest group of affluent white males who also represent most of the social scientific institution. Open and public access to evaluative data at least assures that conflict over results can be announced and shared openly, and not resolved in secret by an allegedly neutral observer. It also permits possible "whistle blowing" by people who feel important truths are being swept under the rug.

Good evaluations might lead to better research on race education/training programs. Many of the questions I have raised in this paper cannot be answered on the basis of knowledge based on theory or on experience. On many of these issues we are all flying by the seats of our pants or

*This does not mean that such neutrality is impossible. But I think neutrality unlikely enough that we ought to guard ourselves against expecting it.

skirts. We must! But we also must start developing the kinds of information that will let us know the answer to some of the tacky questions raised throughout this paper. . . questions of how to alter self-interest, how to balance cognitive and emotional input, how to develop anti-racist peer support groups among whites, how to develop white cross-class and cross-ethnic coalitions that will support rather than attack minorities of color, and how to develop and sustain cross-race coalitions. That kind of research on race education/training would be more than programmatically helpful; it would deal with basic issues in the nature of race relations in America.

Anyone can help with this research. It is too politically sensitive a task to be left solely to universities or "research factories," and to the potential biases inherent therein. Concerned participants must monitor the way doers of research are affected by some of the same race/class/status biases reflected in other organizations.

But this statement of the need for evaluation and the need for research is too facile; probably we all agree, even though it is far too seldom really done. The more important question is how do we know when we have done a good program? What are the criteria for success?* The criteria are related

*In general, the burgeoning field of evaluation research is struggling with just such questions; they are not solely pertinent to our problems in evaluating race training/education.

to program goals, and therefore the choice of evaluative foci must be considered in the context of our discussion of goals on pages 11-17. For instance:

1. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of participants' reactions, announcing a success when they all liked the program? Should attitudes toward the educational experience be the criterion of success?
2. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of reported change in participants' racial awareness? This would relate to goals of reducing individual attitudinal racism. At what level or meaning of awareness would that be (earlier I suggested that new information; new attitudes and new behaviors were all different awareness outcomes)?
3. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of observable changes in participants' behavior? This relates to goals of reducing personal behavioral racism, and to active forms of awareness.
4. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of how whites behave differently toward blacks or members of other minority groups? Or should we also consider whites' behavior towards other whites on racial matters and issues? This relates to the priority we might place on awareness goal #2.
5. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of what changes occur in the norms, rules, policies of the

organizations' participants belong to? This relates to goals of reducing behavioral or cultural racism at the institutional level; it could include organizational conditions of the sort described on pages 46-50. How would we know whether these changes happened by themselves or whether the education/training program had anything to do with it?

6. Should we evaluate a program on the basis of evidence of different "effects and outcomes" in the distribution of key resources and rewards? This relates to my first definition of racism - at the institutional level. In this context, how can we assess non-events, or the non-existence of prior forms of racism?
7. When should we evaluate a program? Before its over? Right afterwards? Sometime later? Can we do it several times, with a variety of follow-ups?
8. And what techniques should be used? Can we assume the same broad range I discussed in the section on Diagnosis (case studies; observations, questionnaires, events - such as responses to data feedback itself)?

It is an error, I believe, to evaluate a program solely on the basis of its internal consistency or the self-reported pleasure or pains of participants. Our work in race training/education must be tied to broader social goals, goals like the reduction of various forms of racism and the increase of awareness defined in the opening sections of this paper. Our

selection of preferred goals and the level of our commitment to the elimination of racism (as opposed to the commitment to run efficient and aesthetically attractive training programs), is the key ingredient to a meaningful evaluation effort.

12. Summary

To recapitulate, I have tried to focus on a number of important dilemmas and issues in race education/training. The root issues in such work derive from our assumptions about the importance of race relations and racism in our society, and our contrasting assumptions about the role and meaning of education/training programs in changing social conditions. I began this review with several alternative definitions of "racism" and "awareness" and several alternative statements of personal and organizational or societal goals for race education/training. Then I reviewed several alternative assumptions about how change in race relations might occur in ourselves and others, and in the organizations and society in which we work and play and live.

Subsequent to these contextual or assumptive explorations, the paper focusses on some more specific and programmatic dilemmas, such as:

Who are appropriate agents or staff for training/education and change? What are important qualifications? Is race? Is politics? What institutional bases do change agents operate from? What are the different options of internal v. external staff? What degree of professionali-

zation of the network of race relations educators/ trainers seems most useful? How can we increase the level of sharing amongst those of us active in this field?

What are the critical elements of a contract for a training/education program? Who sets the program goals? Who are the appropriate parties to a contract-change agents, clients, targets, etc.? How is accountability maintained in performance? And to whom is the staff accountable? What controls does the educator/trainer have over the contract?

What should an organizational diagnosis include? And, what are the critical elements of individual diagnoses? How is it done? How can diagnostic data be utilized in the race education/training program?

What are some important components of a design? What if participants have varied or conflicting goals? How do whites learn best about racism? What cognitive or emotional tactics should be tried? What sequences of events work best? How can we demonstrate authorities' support of the program?

How can we insure maximum effect of a race training/education program on ongoing personal change? How are new attitudes translated into new behavior and sustained over time? What kinds of continuing personal and organizational support for such change can be created? How can the program design aid the development of support groups?

How can training/education programs have impact on organizational change? Is that a totally different strategy for reducing racism, or is there overlap with training/education for individuals? Can individuals change (or sustain change) without organizational changes? How do some organizations resist change?

How can we mobilize community support for race relations education? What roles can active community groups play in facilitating and sustaining organizational change?

What are essential components of an evaluation? Are there different evaluative criteria? How can we use an evaluation? Are other kinds of research or "evaluation research" useful?

The number and importance of unanswered questions is impressive. But so is the entire enterprise of race education/training; especially when we consider the vast social forces

arrayed against its success and mitigating against positive changes in the direction of social justice in America. All of us involved in this field obviously struggle on, regardless of the frustrations and the odds. Our own survival requires self-consciousness about the risks we encounter, the seductions and cooptations we face, the frustrations and burn-outs we see around us. Continued efforts to nibble away at the structures of racist privilege and oppression is the only antidote to being overwhelmed by the magnitude of our agenda.

I hope that the ideas and dilemmas discussed in this paper have contributed to that process of nibbling. And I hope that as a result of our conversations together we are already wiser than I have been in the preliminary statements of dilemmas and designs included here.

References

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D., and Sanford, R. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Amir, Y. The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. Katz (ed.) Towards the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Ashmore, R. and Del Boca, F. Psychological approaches to understanding group conflict. In P. Katz (ed.), Toward the Elimination of Racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Balbus, I. The concept of interest in pluralist and Marxian analysis. Politics and Society, 1971, 6, 151-177.

Berkowitz, L. Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Blalock, M.H.M., Jr. Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Blauner, R. Internal colonialism and ghetto revolt. Social Problems. 1969, 16, 393-408.

Blumer, H. Race prejudice as a sense of group psoition. In J. Masuoka and P. Valien (Eds.), Race Relations: Problems and Theory. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Boggs, J. Racism and the Class Struggle. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.

Buchanan, P. The concept of organizational development or self-renewal as a form of planned change. In G. Watson (ed.), Concepts for Social Change. Washington,D.C. National Training Laboratories, 1967.

Campbell, A. White Attitudes toward Black People. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1971.

Carithers, M. School desegregation and racial cleavages, 1954-1970. Journal of Social Issues,. 1970, 26, 25-47.

Carmichael, S., and Hamilton, C. Black Power. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Chein, I., Deutsch, M., Hyman, H. and Jahoda, M. Consistency and inconsistency in intergroup relations. Journal of Social Issues. 1949, 5, 1-63.

Chesler, M. Contemporary sociological theories of racism. In P. Katz (ed.) Towards the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Chesler, M., Bryant, B., and Crowfoot, J. Consultation in schools: inevitable conflict, partisanship and advocacy. Professional Psychology, 1976 (in press)

Chesler, M. and Worden, O. Persistent problems in power and social change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences. 1974, 10 (4), 462-472.

Cormick, G. and Laue, J. Ethics of intervention in community disputes. In H. Kelman, D. Warwick and G. Bermant, (eds.), Ethics of Social Intervention. New York: Wiley, 1976 (in press)

Cox, O. Caste, Class and Race. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959.

Crain, R. The Politics of School Desegregration. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Crowfoot, J. and Chesler, M. Working with hostile groups: a reexamination. A classic case of 'victim blame'. Social Change, 1975, 5 (3), 3-6.

Dashevsky, A. (ed.) Ethnic Identity in Society. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Deutsch, M., and Collins, M. Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

Doob, L., and Sears, R. Factors determining subject behavior and the overt expression of aggression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1939, 34, 293-313.

Erlich, H. The Social Psychology of Prejudice. New York: Wiley, 1973.

Ewens, W. and Erlich, H. Reference other support and ethnic attitudes as predictors of intergroup behavior. The Sociological Quarterly. 1972, 13, 348-360.

Fiman, B., Nordlie, P., Witten, D., and Sinnott, J. A Review of the literature on institutional racial and sexual discrimination, n.d., mimeo.

Gamson, W. Strategy of Social Protest. Dorsey, Homewood, 1975.

Gardiner, G. Complexity training and prejudice reduction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 326-342.

Hodge, J., Struckman, D., and Trost, L. Cultural Bases of Racism and Group Oppression, Berkeley: Two Riders Press, 1975.

Hyman, H. and Sheatsley, P. Attitudes toward desegregation. Scientific American. 1964, 211, 16-23.

Integrated Education. Your School's Desegregation - How Real? Integrated Education Associates, Chicago: 1971.

Kahn, S. How People Get Power. New York: MacMillian, 1970.

Kargenga, R. The black community and the university, in Robinson, Foster and Ogilvie (eds.) Black Studies in the University. New York: Bantam, 1969.

Katz, D. Functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly. 1960, 24, 163-204.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organizations New York: Wiley, 1966.

Katz, I. Review of evidence relating to effects of desegregation on the intellectual performancy of Negroes. American Psychologist. 1964, 19, 381-399.

Katz, P. Attitude change in children. Can the twig be straightened? In P. Katz (ed.) Towards the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Keninston, K. You have to grow up in Scarsdale to know how bad things really are. Saturday Review, 1969.

Knowles, L., and Prewitt, K. (eds.) Institutional Racism in America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Leeds, M. Absorption of protest. In W. Bennis, K. Benne and R. Chin (eds.) The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Lurie, E. How to Change the Schools. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Lynd, S. Blue collar organizing. Working Papers for a New Society. 1973, 1 (1), 28-34.

Mann, F. Studying and creating change. In W. Bennis, K. Benne, and R. Chin, The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. pp.605-615.

Merton, R. Discrimination and the American creed. In R. MacIver (ed.), Discrimination and National Welfare. New York: Harper, 1949.

Miles, M., Calder, P., Hornstein, H., Callahan, D., and Schiavo, S. Data feedback and organizational change in a school system. Paper read at American Sociological Association meeting, Miami, Florida, August, 1966.

Mill, C. Working with hostile groups. Social Change. 1974, 4 (1), 1-3.

Musick, J. Interaction with black people: white working class perspectives. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1974.

Myrdal, G. An American Dilemma. The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy. New Nork: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.

Nadler, D. The use of feedback for organizational change: promises and pitfalls. Group and Organizational Studies. 1976, 1 (2), 177-187.

Neff, F. Surevy research: A tool for problem diagnosis and improvement in organizations. In A. Gouldner and S. Miller (eds) Applied Sociology: Opportunitities and Problems. New York: Free Press, 1965. p. 23-38.

Nordlie, P. Measuring Changes in Institutional Discrimination in the Army. McLean, VA: Human Sciences Research, 1974.

Novack, M. The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics. NewYork: MacMillan, 1971.

O'Day, R. Rituals of intimidation. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 1974, 10, 373-386.

Pearl, D. Ethnocentrism and the self concept. Journal of Social Psychology. 1954, 40, 137-147.

Pettigrew, T. The Negro and Education: Problems and Proposals. In I. Katz and P. Gurin (eds.), Race and the Social Sciences. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Pettigrew, T. Regional differences in anti-Negro prejudice. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 28-36.

Racial Isolation in the Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Ransford , E. Blue collar anger: Reactions to student and black protest. American Sociological Review. 1972, 37, 333-346.

Reich, M. Economic theories of racism. In M. Carnoy (ed.) Schooling in a Corporate Society. New York: McKay, 1972.

Rokeach, M., and Mezei, L. Race and shared belief as factors in social choice. Science. 1966, 151, 167-172.

Ross, R., and Staines, G. The politics of analyzing social problems. Social Problems, 1972, 20, 18-40.

Rothbart, M. Achieving racial equality: an analysis of resistance to social reform. In P. Katz (ed.) Towards the Elimination of Racism, New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Schmuck, R. Helping teachers improve classroom group processes. Journal of Applied Behavior Science. 1968, 4 (4), 401-435.

Schuman, H. Sociological racism. Trans-Action. 1969, 7, 44-48.

Schuman, H. and Johnson, M. Attitudes and Behavior. Annual Review of Sociology. 1976.

Sedlack, W. and Brooks, G. Racism and Research: Using Data to Initiate Change. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 52, 184-188.

Sorenson, A., Tauber, K., and Hollingsworth, L. Indexes of Residential Segregation for 109 Cities in the United States, 1940-1970. Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, 1974.

Tabb, W. Race relations models and social change. Social Problems. 1971, 18, 431-443.

Tajfel, H. Cognitive aspects of prejudice. Journal of Social Issues. 1969, 25, 79-97.

Tajfel, H., Flament, C., Billig, M., and Bundy, R. Social categorization and intergroup behavior. European Journal of Social Psychology. 1971, 1, 149-178.

Triandis, H. The impact of social change on attitudes. Quoted in P. Katz (ed.) Toward the Elimination of Racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Tumin, M. Introduction. In M. Tumin (ed.) Comparative Perspectives on Race Relations. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

United States Commission on Civil Rights, Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools. Washington,D.C.: USGPO, 1976.

Vanneman, R., and Pettigrew, T. Race and relative deprevation in the urban U.S. Race. 1972, 1972, 13, 461-487.

Weissback, T. Laboratory controlled studies of change of racial attitudes. In P. Katz, (ed.) Toward the Elimination of Racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Worden, O., Levin, G., and Chesler, M. Racism, sexism, and class elitism: change agents' dilemmas in combatting social opporession. In A. Sargent (ed.) Beyond Sex Roles. California: West Publishing Co., 1976.

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE—1977—723-583/378/3-1